

On the Fate of Species

by Means of

Logical Succession

by Bedengus

First Edition

Although it is the second presentation of the Fate of Species

A treaty on human ecology to succeed our unscientific
guesswork that currently dominates Political Economy

Preface

Here in this treaty I could have written things that would be much more pleasing to you, yet certainly not more useful things than that which I have endeavoured to write¹; indeed if the value of the work I set out to accomplish of rather completely rewriting not only our notions of politics but the very art of governing will be as sufficient as the toils invested upon it I neither know nor can consider much² beyond that its adoption is even less likely than my rewriting of our most basic science of Physics, but alas here I put forth those sciences that can most greatly steer us toward a better future – heedless of your temper, which much prefer what is gratifying, I reveal here the full knowledge of the situation for you to more properly decide your course.

On the wonderful Origin of Species, Robert linked what was up to that time distinct facts and showed how those were enough to show how species come to be; the entire focus was on fixing the wrong pseudo-biological ideas of the time so that it did not furnished what those facts also meant for their future – here I use those same facts to answer the long neglected question of what we can infer of their, and our, Fate.

I wrote this as a complement of On the Origin of Subatomic Species where I show deficiencies in our modern framework of the universe and how we already have the answer to them by extending our more advanced views about the course of life to the rest of nature, but although so very profitable and enlightening to learn what makes a valid scientific assertion it is not a requisite to have read it and acquainted oneself with the details of Physics beforehand in order to follow the arguments in this treaty where, after discussing the general Fate of Species, I now apply Logical Succession to a much smaller scale than Biology, which is that of human government.

This brief treaty has as a purpose to show how all human affairs are subject to the same framework of competition, reproduction, extinction and therefore Selection for some optimal form as any living thing; humankind being not more than a small part of Biology and Biology itself being nothing more than a small subset of Chemistry – and likewise just as there is no ‘opinion’ in Chemistry so too in Political Sciences, Economy, Law-making and all ‘non-exact’ disciplines the concept of ‘opinion’ signifies nothing more than ignorance and guesswork by the lack of scientific rigorousness upon it.

That is, there I treated of Natural Philosophy and here I do so in Political, and ‘Moral’, Philosophy; or rather I do what Plato failed to achieve and unify these later as a seamless undistinguishable part of Natural Philosophy.

¹ “τούτων ἐγὼ ἤδιω μὲν ἂν εἶχον ὑμῖν ἕτερα ἐπιστέλλειν, οὐ μέντοι χρησιμωτέρα γε, εἰ δεῖ σαφῶς εἰδότας τὰ ἐνθάδε βουλευσασθαι. καὶ ἅμα τὰς φύσεις ἐπιστάμενος ὑμῶν, βουλομένων μὲν τὰ ἤδιστα ἀκοῦειν, αἰτιωμένων δὲ ὕστερον, ἦν τι ὑμῖν ἀπ’ αὐτῶν μὴ ὁμοῖον ἐκβῆ, ἀσφαλέςτερον ἡγήσασμην τὸ ἀληθὲς δηλῶσαι.”

– Ιστορία του Πελοποννησιακού Πολέμου, History of the Peloponnesian War, VII: 14, where thus Nicias so

² “Facturusne operae pretium sim si a primordio urbis res populi Romani perscripserim nec satis scio nec, si sciam, dicere ausim.”

– Ab Urbe Condita I: I

² “Facturusne operae pretium sim si a primordio urbis res populi Romani perscripserim nec satis scio nec, si

The Steps To Extinction

I – Speciation Is Specialization

I would like to start saying something cool like 'ninety nine dot nine nine nine per cent of all animals that have ever lived are not only already dead, but extinct', but we have first to wonder what 'extinction' mean.

It looks pretty obvious that it is 'when all members of a species die', although throughout most of human history it was denied that the gods would allow their creation to just cease to exist forever, however we have the problem that the definition hinges on the concept of 'species'; which happens to mean nothing at all in rigorous science.

If you have no offspring, for example, your genes will go extinct; your parents produced you and their parents produce them and so on through a successful line of descent that now spans billions of years just to then be broken by you failing to continue it on – but do not feel bad, as just said well over ninety nine per cent of all things have failed too!

And in our case we can leave much more impactful legacies for the future of our 'species' than some cool genes.

But the point of that illustration is that you have unique genes; mostly from your parents, but the chemical gradient and epigenetic of how your parents lived, or just some unforeseen outside interference, led to a remix of their position and an inexact copy of the DNA strand making yours thus unique – even if you have a twin.

So we can say that 'your genes have gone extinct', but just from what was said before that is rather meaningless since your offspring would not have your exact genes either; they would only have some approximate copy, and that they can get from your brothers or nearest kin – your general 'species'.

Thus the old mystical term of 'species' is today maintained most often as any set of animal that can interbreed; which has several known 'barrier' for the process of successful reproductive offspring and which is very useful when discussing the genetic diversity of specific populations – yet not here.

To see why let us go yet again back to that initial cool line; and then wonder 'if so many are extinct then do we today only have a fraction of the species that used to inhabit the globe?' or 'is the world now much poorer in biodiversity than then all those species lived together?' – to which answer to both is easily 'no'.

Simply we can just see how there were no lions in the time of the dinosaurs; we do not have mosasaurs in our sea today, but rather than 'one species shorter' we then have whales which did not exist back then – and we can understand why when we consider the consequences of such 'extinction' not as some genetic pool in specific but the effects the animal has upon its environment and its adaptation to the same.

That is called a 'niche'.

When the drifting ocean plates, for example, spread apart allowing the mantle to melt and flow out to the area of lower pressure we have the formation of new sea floor; of new underwater volcanoes – and of new volcanic island and their archipelagos.

I do not expect even the less sane people to say that such lava had with it its own biota, but it is clear how from some mainland seeds are carried and animals likewise populating it as the conquerors of a new land.

Some plants, like floating coconuts, will easily get there and so it is that we found the thing all around the globe within the climate band it can support, but some hardier nuts can be expected and from the excrement of birds come both nutrition and undigested seeds; amphibians are very rarely found on any volcanic island and we can see why since it cannot tolerate the salt water and thus also why reptiles and mammals will have more success in colonizing it – all after birds, of course, which go everywhere and also poor insects stowing away in seeds or the wind against its will.

Thus we will have some coconuts, nuts and fruits besides pure leaves with some insects, herbivorous or insectivorous lizards and then some generic bird.

The plants fill the island until there is no available land or resources and likewise the insects spread to occupy them all, but their population is soon reduced by a different factor as the lizards and birds feed on the insects and limit their numbers.

The coconut is of course beyond the capacity of the tiny birds, but they might manage the nuts and they do enjoy the fruits; and as any breeder might tell you the beaks of birds, and their colouration and all else, is highly variable and they transmit it to their offspring so that many proudly claim that they can breed 'any characteristic you wish' given a certain amount of time for them to select from each generation that characteristic he wishes to enhance further – and likewise on the island the challenge of dealing with the nuts will be too great for the birds with the smallest or softer beaks so that they will prefer fruits, while those with larger and stronger beaks will benefit of less competition for his food of choice.

The pressure on the beak and usage of muscles, if not by their brain throwing nuts on rocks, will lead to epigenetic changes in how their DNA is organized; and the chemistry of its body, and therefore the production of gametes, cannot possible be the same as with a different combination

of hormones and genes due to a different life style – and thus by usage, or desuage, that characteristic itself is subject to special attention as it is passed on.³

Birds that tend to eat of the same thing on the same area are more likely to perform that selection mating with those of a bigger beak, but even if they mix and mate with those of the fruit-loving faction their offspring might not be so successful as the same competition and improvement for the best beak for fruit is evolving in there so that it would be worse than both ‘races’ in the competition of life; and thus those female with a preference for larger beaks will most often survive and transmit on their sexual selection for the most fit members of its race so that with ten thousand other factors of their behaviours we see nature itself so strongly now performing that ‘breeding’ towards the best nut-eating bird.

And there is also the insect faction; and some discovering a taste for lizards will be selected for talons and beaks with a sharp point to tear flesh as some piscivorous ones might be interested too – indeed that bird population is too successful and out of control, how advantageous if one of the lizard-eating kind start to prey on that plethora of passive birds all around!

We thus see on volcanic island not the animals from the mainland, but slight different ‘versions’ of them; several ‘allied species’ clearly related, but not exactly like those of the mainland – with slightly different adaptations and behaviours from the shape of their beaks and wings to entirely new organs and interests.

From a sparrow to an eagle, a giant condor, a goose or a coconut-carrying swallow.

Even the coconut would not be safe for long; the nut-loving lineage could benefit of not wasting energy flying if it can get food safely on the ground by simply growing big – as it destroyed the coconuts, however, what would happen to it once the tree could germinate no more?

Well, with no food it would clearly go extinct; the extinction of the coconut tree meant the extinction of the bird – and everything else that depended on either of them.

That is a consequence of extinction.

³ And so the exposure to the sun darkens the skin not only of the individual by those stimuli inducing the production of more melanin, but those epigenetic changes cannot but affect the entire chemistry of their body and thus their offspring; the eating of wheat did not condemn all who were ‘too unlucky to get a mutation’ to death, but just like on the skin the entire population convergently evolved by that epigenetic change favouring the further development and repeated copies of that gene which was so excessively expressed.

That is the greater point of Robert in how usage, after the ‘random’ acquirement of some characteristic, is what can bring it to such high degree of perfection; our modern model casually says it is a series of random ones, and nothing more, being selected by the mere reproduction of death of the animal is what lead to those structures; which is indeed entirely possible, but would take several times the age of the universe before even causing the simplest of changes such as the uniform dominance of some skin colour or several repeated genes coding for the enzyme for the digestion of starch on a population.

Likewise if some pest strikes any tree or animal the birds that depend on them will equally suffer and go extinct with it, but as those disappear is the island now condemned to decadence?

Supposing no new coconut appears there can happen something interesting; as plants that are digested are killed off from the population and only those able to resist survive their selective breeding goes on – the conditions might be advantageous for the nuts to grow bigger now and to grow on higher where the birds cannot pluck them before their time, or simply for the sake of sunlight which is the reason ‘trees’ are a thing since they are not closely related to each other but that just describes that general strategy.

And so a coconut-like thing might appear; and the coconut-eater once again will eventually appear.

The ‘original bird’ was like that also for exact reasons; it could eat of fruits and nuts so it was a generalist, and that was due from the competition from the mainland, but when species is extinct there, or a new environment just appear before it like islands, it will then spread and fill in the niches – the original bird too is now an extinct species, even though it left so many offspring, since it could not compete with the more specialized forms for any of those foods, but given the opportunity another generalist quite alike it will equally reappear.

That, too, is a consequence of extinction.

And that is why after so much extinction we still have a world so full of diversity; extinction, like death, happens non-stop and the production of new ‘species’, called speciation, quite like birth also happens non-stop – although just as cultists denied extinction it is, sadly, still common the baseless belief that somehow ‘new species’ cannot be formed even when it is both a necessary consequence of recognizing extinction as the result of the competition for life and the inheritance of characteristics from those most fit survivors.

So that some ‘clearly distinguishable specialized animal that changed to the point its can no longer procreate with its original’ is the classical concept of species, although far from perfect as it is simply some arbitrary division we made up for convenience and not some extradimensional perfect Platonic Form that sets boundaries as some ‘natural law’ of a base model from which they partake from and from which their degree of variation is limited.

But I do not want to talk about that; or actually, I do want to talk about that – the noble science of Natural History paints the wonderful picture of how our world has changed and how we, and all things around us, came, by a succession of steps, to acquire our current form and organization.

We can spend thousands of hours travelling through time talking about we know for certain, what we suspect and all the speculations of what could have been!

But that is not what I want to talk about in this treaty.

That above definition of species is very well established and you can learn about the speciation of our humankind or any other animal in grand details all around the internet; the ‘species’ I want to talk about here is that of the succession and evolution of ‘niches’.

II – Cursed Selection

When first learning the mechanisms of biology, or perhaps just as a very feeble attempt at mockery, many ask ‘if evolution acts for the good of the organism, why then are there no laser guns on animals?’; or about wheels and any other thing that appear to be so superior in benefit to anything they have, but which we do not see being used in nature.

With no need to diverge from our modern model we have the common replies that ‘evolution has no prescience’, to counter that sneaky introduction of some intention or will of some force ‘for the good of the organism’, and then that ‘at each stage, it being useful to the animal, it is selected for’; so any complex ‘organ of great perfection’ as the eye was not ‘a mutation’, but almost countless from the simplest molecule which could be acted upon by light and being so very useful the mutations that rendered it useless and blind were fatal to the organism while any further improvement made the organism more fit to pass on those successful genes.

And so without any ‘goal’ nature is simply in an endless battle; only those that manage to survive pass on their successful characteristics – forming not a March of Progress of some better and better lineage, but a branching tree speciating into countless forms of which only very few survive on and specialize further those more primitive parts where other lineages abandon those parts entirely.

So then we see the nut-loving birds and wonder; why did it not evolve to have a metal beak fitted on a hydraulic piston rather than bones and keratin with muscles then and easily crack anything it wants?

And from the simple competition, which leads to the ‘principles’ above, we can see that first it would first need to start depositing iron on its beak before making a hydraulic piston for it; it already has the haemoglobin protein for its blood cells so it would need a mutation to collect more iron and deposit it on its beak – which at first would make it beak heavier, more resource-intensive to build and likely just mess its structure into a weaker one.

It would be less fit; the non-mutated birds would outcompete it – it was not going to be a beneficial mutation.

And thus it would be good to have the metal beak with the hydraulic piston, however the changes towards that end goal are not selected for; it would require the beak and animal efficiency to become worse before it could start improving again to new heights – which less fit animals would be selected against.

Far from being ‘perfect’ the savagery of nature is an awful designer; the best it can do is to make it ‘good enough’ – never ‘perfect’, but simply ‘good enough for these exact limited conditions against this other shitty competition’.

Thus it is that our ‘so perfect eye’ has blind spots by its wiring system passing in front of it rather than any design; so that we, and giraffes and all mammals, have the nerve of our larynx going not straight to the brain from our throat, but down looping by the aorta at the heart before going back up – and how our backs and knees grow so awfully painful in their wearing and tearing since they are still so badly adapted to our upright style.

And so on goes the barely-functional patchwork of nature; from tiny change to tiny change, preserving those that are at least not a detriment – no plan, design or goal, but merely the savagery of existing upon a sphere of limited space where not all seeds can germinate.

The only known power that can analyse the present in order to infer the past and the future – that can predict, design and optimize for the absolute best – is the human mind.

An organic computing device that was, of course, the product of that inferior selection of nature; but happily we have no developed bigger jaws to munch on roots, as our boisei cousins, but the brain capacity to learn how to boil it into edible softness.

Two strategies that were both successful at the time, but which today left very different results; thus let us finish this mainstream concept that you can learn on any respectable place online so that we can investigate what our prescient brain tell us about those two paths.

That state of an animal where it could be better, but it is ‘stuck’, is known as an ‘island of stability’; it cannot change because any small change leads it downhill in fitness – look for the ‘surface plot’ and see the wonderful graphic rendering of how all the selective pressure of the animal would drive it into a local maxima from which it could not reach all the taller fitness mountains surrounding it.

Selection merely drives it uphill; stuck on whichever peak it reaches it cannot ‘jump’ to another.

But if we observe the wilderness the miniscule and poor cheap seeds of maize cannot have any profit in becoming a giant grain rich in sweet starch; or for the nasty hard banana to turn into a soft seedless desert in a convenient package – or any niche for a single wild herb to turn into both broccoli and cauliflowers or collard, kale and green or purple cabbage, much less from brussel sprouts and tiny turnip-like things to plants over six. How much less purely ornamental flowers!

Of course cows too, or its calf, have no need for so much milk and so much fat; no chicken need such cumbersome bulk or could benefit from the giant waste of laying so many sterile eggs – and the ten thousand other changes domestication has inflicted upon animals, from the extreme deformation and incapacitation of dogs for mere whim to the stupid passivity of others.

And how worse off our triploid fish and seedless plants!

That is called ‘artificial selection’ as if it is a different process, but all we did was to change the environment; our influence overwhelmed every other selective pressure so that we changed that fitness surface plot raising, or funnelling, it whoever way we intended; although such roundaboutness should be soon past as we will much more directly engineer their desired properties at their DNA achieving an once undreamt level of usefulness from them.

Nature, too, is far from static and the environments change; therefore changing with them those pressures and peaks of fitness – hardly there being the ‘islands of stability’ that have taken over biology.

Rather our human mind can foresee those changes of climate; its effects – and how those selective pressures will change, just as we intentionally did so in our artificial selection.

Now to the boisei and the sapiens, or more simply the birds; it can evolve the bigger beak to crack nuts, or it can fill that niche by developing the mental faculties to use a tool to crack it or fly high and drop it as some do – the former will go extinct with the tree as any plague strikes, the later will not.

Of course it is not so easy to predict some pestilence that will wipe out the plant population so let us consider more certain phenomena; as the death of the flightless birds, and other animals, of that island as the sea level inevitably rises as the world leaves an ice age, and so on – a change in climate which is naturally a change of those selective pressures.

Today a nice classification system for endangered species; or better saying, its ‘conservation status’. It is meant to show ‘how likely a group is to go extinct in the near future’; which takes into account the derivative of the population, that is the rate of increase, as well as the known threats.

But as we can see even if both of those seem equally successful with a healthy stable population currently they future is very different; one bird has tied its fate to the tree – it is much more vulnerable to change and less resilient.

On the revolutions of the surface-plot of fitness we can see it will be dragged down by its chosen path; whilst a much brighter future expects the other one – and so likewise we could draw that classification system to how beneficial some change was to the organism and predict its most probable future, since we have the foresight that evolution lacks.

A famous anecdote nowadays that avocados have grown so popular is about their giant seed; something that obviously cannot be eaten by humans, who are one of the largest animals in the planet, and much less dispersed by all the others animals in the area – an adaptation that no doubt allowed it to remain alive as it passed the intestines of the megafauna that inhabited the region and so bigger and bigger seeds were selected for, but that as those giant animals went extinct it too was doomed to extinction.

Until humans took a liking to it.

But while the prospect seems so dreadful to some in how we would have never had such a fruit and our saving it from disappearing forever, it happens nonstop to some many things that exist for so little time we should never find even traces of them.

One might be bewildered at the study of plants and of insects how many 'different species' there are; over eighty per cent of all animal 'species' are insects!

But a closer look makes it clear the reason; of how flowers that look like female insects of some species or that have some particular smell will more successfully attract it and likewise the insects will develop abilities to make use of it – a tiny runaway evolutionary race where they co-evolve and soon become unable to live without the other.

And then they die.

The numbers make it seem like a successful strategy, but rather those who took that path are soon extinct at the slightest disturbance and new ones are falling on that trap continuously.

Another lover of flowers are hummingbirds with their slender curved beaks and giant tongues so that they can enjoy the rich nectar, but much more impressive is their flight where they can move three dimensionally in the air and just loom still at the level of the flower to feed; adaptation which costs a ridiculous amount of energy and at a cold day where they need even more energy or if they do not find enough of the hundreds of flowers they need to visit to stay alive, they die of starvation.

Flowers also evolve long petals, to which their tongue and beak is evolved to, and will go extinct with the hummingbirds after any period of bad weather, if there are no butterflies with their giant tongues to pollinate them still.

What seems like the opposite of such strategy is that of the olm salamander; who live more than humans and can spend years without feeding – but then with such slow metabolism they have an equally slow rate of reproduction and distribution, vulnerable to extinct as it suffer to adapt to the gradual changes of every system.

What those strategies have in common is that they are all extreme specialization; their adaptations move towards a peak that is beneficial only on the exact circumstances of the present, but which trap them into conditions completely fatal as the environment changes.

And so the icefish of the Channichthyidae are famous for their colourless blood as they lost their haemoglobin; a quite unique adaptation that conferred to them advantage in not needing that expensive resource on its cold waters rich in oxygen, however such momentarily advantage lead it

into the trap injurious, and fatal, to all of its future – having now a much bigger heart than normal and much more fluid on its body than those who produce the proteins to carry oxygen.

And their environment will continue on getting hotter, and thus holding less oxygen, so that they are condemn to eventual extinction just as that ephemeral abnormal environment it tied itself to.

Much more common than that gigantic environment and gradual planetary cycle we have those that specialize to micro habitats; a well-documented example being the spray frogs of Kihansi which lost many of its adaptation to live on land since they adapted to their extremely humid environment at the spray of the waterfall – to which any change to the meandering river, from a time of draught to their path, would extinguish it.

As did happen, although that change was a human dam and it was preserved in captivity.

This is not a rare tale or some special animals; just as in island we find unique species, caused by their separation from the main population as they speciate further to their new environment, so too lakes are full of unique species as inverted islands and so too are mountains unique environments amid an expanse of another environment – so that as the climate warms and the cold mountain top change we are having a mass extinction of all the frogs and other species that only exist on one mountain each.

Those species will all go extinct in the near future; the preservation of the Kihansi frog above is rather vain – we will not, nor is there any point, in creating an eternal stagnant artificial environment that will accommodate that organism.

All those adaptations and changes that drove those species up the mountain were undoubtedly advantageous to the organism and they very likely outcompeted their own brethren taking their place and in turn being surpassed by the next specialized form of it, but of course to us who can predict the future that was a very stupid change that sealed their fate to certain extinction as that very environment was doomed from the start – yet this is the work of blind selection.

Sea turtles are a symbol for the ocean pollution, but we affect them in so many different ways; one which is light pollution, as our artificial lights attract the babies to death, by predation or dehydration or exhaustion, since they evolved to follow the moonlight – on the same light pollution there are our artificial reflective superficies which reflect polarized light just like water and thus tricks aquatic insects into depositing eggs there in vain.

And so on with sound pollution and many others where we directly, intentionally or not, make an useful adaption become harmful to them; that is an already known concept and called ‘evolutionary traps’, but those are some very limited case in comparison to the greater scope I have mentioned above.

They are more akin to the concept of ecological traps; which is when a disaster strikes and destroys an environment so that the animals there are forced to flee to a new place. To judge how good the new place is they use the presence of some plant or humidity or climate and so on, but those measured trained for their former environment do not directly translate to how good it is to then and so we often observe animals migrating to a poorer environment – but that has those characteristics of their preferred environment – instead to a medium quality one.

Every multicellular organism is in itself a complex environment, as an ecological island, and a very ‘successful’ strategy would be for a cell to stop contributing to the general order, and suiciding after a few divisions, and instead hog the maximum resources it can while dividing and spreading to the best of its capacity; that is indeed what those discreet organisms do on the greater forest-organism or any other environment and what we humans so mindlessly have done to the extreme in this last century – but of course such blind ‘success’ known as ‘cancer’ is in reality the very doom of that species rather than the successful change to a brighter longer future as it in truth shares of that harm it causes since the collapse of that host-environment means its extinction too’.

Or back to that volcanic island, how successful would be an adaptation where a bird could straight out eat the wood directly? Extremely so; with free food everywhere all yearlong with competition only with its own direct brothers. But of course we straight away see how utterly fatal that success would be for everything else on the island, including itself; once they ate the last tree they themselves would starve with no options left just as they killed every other animal – we see how that so immediately advantageous selection is a cursed success, so eerily akin to our own behaviour, that dooms them to extinction rather than increasing their resilience and amplifying their future options.

And that is what I meant with the above that we can judge how good some change is; not only to its immediate success, but for the long term if it makes it a more resilient species with more options to further diversify and improve or if it is more like the event horizon of an evolutionary black hole where it falls into an arms-race with itself or some other dependent organism into the dead-end of extreme specialization doomed to extinction at the eventual inevitable change of its environment.

In view of that cumulative nature of the choices we can now classify organism not in how they are faring immediately, but on the grand scheme of nature; where is it headed – how bright or doomed is its future when considering the future revolutions and changes that will take place in all environments?

¹ There is a ‘one-celled dog’ of a cancer that not only survived the immune system of its original host, but that of others dog too turning into something akin to an infectious disease; so that rarely cancer does survive the original organism, but of course the point in question remains entirely unchanged as its future is a bleak downward spiral of genetic degeneration.

III – Favoured Selection

Let us consider lions.

They hunt in packs; their success rate increases, they care for the wounded and they so well protect their cubs – although not so much for the last one as a new head of a pack will kill every baby of the previous leader in order to further his own species, but on the giraffes they hunt, zebras, buffalos and elephants the pack so well protects the young.

Social behaviour leads to the development of many new capacities, and the specialization of individuals, rather than the narrowing down to a single strategy.

Rhinoceroses are one of the most famous endangered animals, but even as we try to save them they make it very hard; their aggressive behaviour make them kill each other more than any other threat while in conservation – just as tigers with their solitary behaviour and giant territories have a nature that directly opposes all our attempts at helping preserve it.

The tiger is very fit for its environment, but its environment is not eternal; and it is not fit for change – as for lions they have an entire environment that the tiger lacks, the social environment, where ideas are passed on and selected infinitely faster than the hard-coded behaviour of genes.

Much beyond the mere physical help of a group the distinct culture they develop is akin to an organism; instantly tweaking each of its parts to fit the immediate necessities with incomparable plasticity in its behaviour – a new more efficient way of selection as comparing unicellular to multicellular life.

Tigers live in a wide range of environment, not only plains as lions, and can perform much more impressive feat of strength be it on a direct fight or outcompeting lions in the pursuit of prey in land, arboreal environment or water; yet just as it can easily also kill or outcompete a single human it has no chance against the pride of lions working together just as it has no chance against the collective human society – that single trait by itself give such different future prospects to animals that are so similar anatomically.

It is thus that it is not the most fit animal of some period that leaves its offspring to rule over the next, but the most versatile; as the most specialized, and fit, to that exact condition is extinct with the change of conditions it is the most flexible who then radiates and takes over the new environment – and as that too changes over time it will once again not be the offspring most fit to the new environment, but the most efficient at adapting.

On a short time scale, as in an static environment, it is the most fit who takes the advantage, but nothing is static in nature and be it from the repeated natural cycles, catastrophic events or just the

drift of the biota it will change; time after time – preserving the most efficient at Selection on and on.

That is simply saying that on a changing surface-plot the most fit are truly those that can most readily adapt to the changes, and not those who at some point reached some local, or absolute, maxima in some static frame; in the long term then that blind selection is asymmetric as it directionally selects for more efficient means of selection more than anything else – on a changing environment, as the world is, versatility is the optimal strategy eventually selected for.

Taking a look at our young earth then we would see how by their densities the elements are selected deep into the mantle or high in the atmosphere and everywhere in between shoved exactly whither the conditions of their environment selected them for; and some times that collision is enough to bind the atoms into molecules which by their stability and by their production are present at some concentration in that abiotic earth.

We see some molecules doing something strange, however. They do not seem as random or ephemeral as all the others, but to our mind they exhibit a pattern as if it had some purpose; their shape and organization does not cause some ‘random effect’ on its surrounding like many others, but that effect selects exactly for replicating itself – it exhibits then some structure and selects for the periodic increment of it, a crystal.

But it has still to wait for those materials to get close enough; how much more effective and blessed by selection would it be if it could swim and gather those materials?

Selection favours nothing more strongly than that improvement of selection itself.⁵

As the first structures that we arbitrarily would call ‘alive’ appear, be them free-swimming DNA-like things around vents in a free environment or already within their closed oily environments, they copy themselves and suffer mutation from all that disturbance around; so that some stability for the process of copying, some cell wall, is strongly selected for as the improved means of selection itself.

Specialization is as fickle and dangerous as on the greater organisms; it happens nonstop, and like rock stars they are very successful for a single moment and then die young.

Yet they can form colonies; if many cyanobacteria come together it is best for some to generate only sugar from the sun and some others be kept alive with that sugar produced by others in order for them to simply produce nitrogen – some coordinated and flexible specialization.

⁵ Selection selects for more efficient means of selection. Beautiful. Read *On the Origin of Subatomic Species* in order to see how indeed there are ‘laws’ and ‘elementary particles’ in physics just as much as there are ‘species’ in biology; that is, an arbitrary term based on old creationist superstitions rather than the scientific understand of how that shape and behaviour evolved from a series of sequential steps selecting for it.

If we peer into those unicellular bacteria we see many structures already that would be worthless on their own, but which addition to some other 'main structure' of a self-replicating organism that can also replicate that structure make them valuable; and further on single cells that have many organelles and complex specialized parts within it that could not function on the free environment outside – and then our multicellular selves that not only sustain that complex super-specialization of cells, as no free-swimming one could ever find advantageous to have such specialization by itself, but also to create our very personal environment where the effect of outside interference in our exact replication of the entire structure and its organization to each are so strongly selected for.

Bacteria are 'very successful' when you consider numbers alone and how wild spread they are and some unicellular things are very resistant to things that would kill many times over big animals, yet all that more-complex selection increased the resilience of the animal and its future; the most versatile lives on – a little change in **PH** in the water will kill them, while more 'advanced' things, more resilient things, can just walk out of the pond or have some complex mechanism to deal with it.

If our planet explode, or rather when it does so since it will fall out of orbit and be thrown adrift in space or engulfed by the sun, such less resilient things will be doomed with it; and only some that evolve means to survive in space, to gather resources and to define a direction to flee to will survive – that is the only term resilience that the simpler organism cannot achieve, but which the continue selection of better-means-of-selection leads to as the most versatile lives on.

There is thus these plateaus on our surface-plot where a revolution in the means of selection themselves leads to a new wave of possibilities and different environments; which truly is the only, very arbitrary, difference between the selection of chemicals and crystals to that of 'living beings'.

With this in mind we can now consider the future; what all these facts infer about how this world will change and the fate of the creatures in it as we are living on the onset of the new explosion of complexity as a new means of selection, and finally one with foresight, is produced.

IV – The Fate Of Species

Ninety nine dot nine nine nine per cent of all animals that have ever lived are not only already dead, but extinct; and ninety nine dot nine nine nine per cent of all animals that are currently alive today will not eventually only die, but will go extinct.

That should be an obvious fact from even any shallow consideration of the initial phrase, and much more from the previous pages stated here.

But of course that does not mean we can continue in this our mass extinction rampage just accelerating the inevitable; if we want to be one of the zero dot zero zero zero something we have to take much better care of our environment than what we have done in the last few centuries.

To unveil then how they so die let us analyse the more fit and successful organism that will outcompete them; that favoured by selection on the longer term as they amplify their options rather than diminishing them – the more intelligent ones.

That also implies a different and more concrete definition of ‘intelligence’, which is often treated as a very hard thing to compare between animals.

So let us take bees; and while a bunch of them seem pretty ‘dumb’ and simply use their own cocoons to put the honey in the most famous one looks like a genius building the most efficient structure possible for the storage – hexagons.

Ants are also famous for their buildings; as if prescient of meteorological phenomena they build their house with a complex defensive architecture; not only the usage of air pressure hindering the water to flood in, but there are paths for the absorption and redirecting through the earth with drainage channels controlling the very climate within their home – they also partake of the eusociality of bees and some even kidnap infants of other species to use as slaves, besides those that practice agriculture and only forage for leaves to feed their fungus which then eat.

We humans only started agriculture a few thousand years ago, while the ants have been going at it for millions of years before primates even came into existence, and only more recently our science advanced enough for us to understand the structural marvel of their buildings.

But is that the indicators of intelligence?

Such discoveries drastically advanced humankind since from them we inferred further their meanings, but the stagnant state of those animals should already hint that something is not right if those feats are the ‘intelligence’ we are discussing.

For example some ants have grown so dependent on their slaves that if they are taken away they are no longer able to feed themselves; even with abundant food stored they starve to death waiting for the non-existent slave to bring it to them!

Likewise farming is a much more common practice; sloths grow algae on their fur while many animals at hydrothermal vents cultivate chemosynthetic bacteria on their body which then they eat.

Just as Robert, seeing that, we can clear see that is very far from intelligence, but merely some 'very polished' instinct.

Thus 'intelligence' I define as that very 'versatility' which is selected for; not some hard-coded instinct to perform some action, but that part of the brain able to perform computations and produce a personalized answer to the problem.

Faster than any coat of hair or layer of blubber can grow or beak and claws be adapted to a task some creature becomes able to analyse its conditions and procure the solution immediately; this new plateau of intelligence is what is most strongly selected – as a more efficient means of selection.

Many birds, octopussies and primates are known for the usage of tools and are on the process of selection for that breakthrough, but of course humans are the only example we have left of this lineage with a brand new means of selection; which was often called a 'soul' and the thing that differentiates us from all animals, but which of course is merely the result of that blind selection in producing some organic computing device – which has already produced designs that would never come to be by the previous less efficient means of selection.

We do not need to develop resistance to poisons, and which it would be impossible to all, and to diseases as we can study and produce the cure instantly selecting the possibilities in our mind; we do not even need to make a coat against the elements above, as we can directly control the climate be it with a shelter, a city environment or on a larger scale – and faster than any animal run, fly or swim we can build instruments for that, and directly change that DNA to express more helpful traits and cure its defects rather than waiting forever for the previous means of selection to weed it out.

That is our present situation in the reality we are living right now and not some prediction; which sounds greater than the wildest science fiction even if we stay at the more tame one that we are already sure will happen – and at that situation we can now also consider the vision of absolute terror that it brings to the future of all other species.

We have, mostly quite intentionally, greatly changed the environments of the world with the new urban biome and long farmlands just as with the mass extraction of resources, but it came to our attention that we did much also unintentionally as the product of our work to improve our lives led to drastic changes on the chemistry of the earth.

Our worry on that front is not just about ‘saving the animals’, but we depend on those ecosystems to sustain our society and as they fail, and as the weather gets more extreme, our lives get worse; of the little over a hundred billions of humans how have lived most died before reaching twenty years old – today we have crushed most causes of death that have haunted humankind, but also some new ones have appeared peculiar to our own age.

Thus we are at the time that it is being decided how to deal not only with this immediate climate crisis, but with the very engineering of our planet; for decades now there have been ever more strict regulation of every product in stopping the pollution and release of chemicals that we have unknowingly harmed the world with, but even if that was sufficient we would not then just stop leaving ‘nature’ to run its course – we will clean up the trash we left, but we will continue on further in changing those environments to a beneficial way for us.

Three years ago cargo ships were forbidden to use their polluted fuel, however far from being all positive gains that ban is also harming us since the pollution unintentionally served as nucleation sites to seed clouds and thus increase the albedo of the planet reflecting light back to space; so that more than just stop messing it up we have to proactively change that environment, as spraying water up in the middle of the ocean, in order to improve it – we will now intentionally change those environment not only to fix it back, but we will artificially select that environment for the general benefit of all.

This balance of ecosystems are maintained by the systems themselves; each animal and plant play their parts as a giant self-correcting clockwork – which is also why our disturbances have been mostly ignored until we saw that if we push too far we break those cogs and it all collapses downhill unable to fix itself back.

So that when some apex predator goes extinct we put it back in; as famously the helicopter dropping of wolves in the Yellow Stone Park so that the system would fix itself back as the uncontrolled elk population was harming all other things in there towards collapse – and when some new species comes into an environment and has the advantage of lacking predators there we call it ‘invasive’ and work to exterminate it.

We do not let the course of natural selection to just run; waiting for some carnivorous elk to rise or the system to collapse until a new one spreads back and so on – that would be very troublesome to us and so we interfere and shape those natural environments to that artificially stable and controlled state.

Indeed wildfires are such an annoyance to us that the United States went into a war against it and stopped them from happening entirely; just to then suffer catastrophic giant wildfires like never before – so that now, learning the world is much more complex than some impulsive thoughtless decision, we perform intentional wild fires to get rid of that flammable accumulation and to allow the trees to feel the heat that control their lifecycle, but we do it when it is most convenient to us.

That control and manipulation of the environments will only increase; and when the introduction of some animal or its encouragement does not cut it, we will put on our own solutions – it will be replaced by the more efficient, more fit, alternative that we ourselves create.

We receive a multitude of services from nature, and we deal with many harmful phenomena; and we will continue on doing our best to mitigate the later and improve the former.

We have done much of that unintentionally and most often to our detriment as that wildfire case above or this current blunder of our climate crisis with its mass extinction rapidly underway,

Not merely as this blunder of our current climate crisis with its mass extinct that is rapidly underway, but now we are already geoengineering to both fix our mistakes and to improve the services while mitigating the harm of those environment while inevitably in time our products will succeed them as more beneficial to us than the unpropositional blind fate of nature; we will not forfeit the future and stagnate, and if we do that until we rot and go extinct that course will be followed by some other species later, but continuously geoengineer towards what is more fruitful for us – not on our unintentional reckless of the present, but consciously of the controlled change for a less hostile and more optimal world.

For already today no natural might can now resist our hand; it is thus impossible to ignore it any longer and so haphazardly wield it with no care, but to prevent harm to both the world and us we will have to direct our hand to intentionally cultivate and nourish it to the healthiest state.

We have long suffered in our agriculture as we slowly understood the advantages or certain climates, certain soils, the treatment of those and of our care against pests and in favour of nutritional matters; until we understood the chemical makeup of such food and produced our own fertilizer for more optimal plants we selected for – and now the population quadrupled from a hundred years ago, most of whom eat the food produced by a single same process to capture atmospheric nitrogen for crops rather than the natural nitrogen-fixing fungi of certain roots.

On many other things we are entirely dependent of nature and share the fragility of all the numberless layers of organisms and natural processes we have to rely on beyond any control or even proper prediction of their behaviour; and as soon as we can we will also take control of such factors that leaves us at the mercy of whimsical nature from the oxygen and carbon cycles to the temperature of our planet, its composition and all destructive phenomena – in which course we will have to replace the current systems as they lead to mutual inaptitude in relying on those factors beyond our control.

In our whim we may choose to keep pets and pristine reserves for our pleasure; we may create mammoth-like animals or any other, but if left in the world they will go extinct either by directly dying or by being select to be more akin to more fit modern forms – the only way to keep such,

and preserve our modern ones in the future, is to also create and maintain that unique environment for it for in nature nothing will last.

As humankind both expands and advance less and less of 'wilderness' is left; both because that word is entirely ambiguous meaning nothing truly defined to be able to be discussed and then because as we come to explore and understand how it all is connected and thus the impact they all suffer we no longer consider it that 'untouched nature' of wilderness - and as we continue advancing the less 'wilderness' there will be.

Not because we will turn it all on farmland or cover the ocean with fish pens, but exactly for the reason many so wildly want to 'restore the mammoth steppes' by bringing large grazing animals to keep that giant plain; because we understand how much more powerful of a carbon storage it is than forests and most environments and all others useful services we receive from it - just as forests have their proper services and the swamplands we have filled over are being dug back to play their role in the water cycle capturing carbon, filtering and stopping floods.

We need those services; and thus we need those environments.

But are they optimal and perfect doing the best possible job?

Very far from it; and we can calculate and tell how flawed they are.

We will thus change them; we will control the conditions for them to flourish favouring that which is most useful to us, we will make metal machines that help them do that job and we will finally genetically engineer that bio-machinery to achieve the optimal service they can provide - that is the niche available in our future, and the species that fill that niches are the ones who will survive on.

That is the Fate of Species; our current environments did not exist long ago and will not exist in the future - but this time rather than the usual gradual drift and change it is a single organism that will take, and has taken, them all over, with our organic and metallic crafts being the new species that will outcompete all current ones.

Economic Disadvantages

I - The Selection Of Ideas

Now that we have quickly gone over the natural world, which proper details and consequences can fill ten thousand books, let us pass to the main dish of this treaty; the way humans conduct politics and its economy – are we ready to tackle that monumental change of the world?

The answer is clearly a resounding ‘no’.

In fact we have the technological power to solve almost all of our current suffering and which has cursed humankind with no cure throughout all its history, but it is the mis-governance and not the lack of capacity to perform it the great cause of all current misery; indeed the progress of our science is so grand that our incompetent governments are overburdened by its greatness and more threatened by internal decay from its misuse than by the outside powers of nature.

Besides all such self-inflicted harm of our internal strife there is still the question just treated in how we adapt and deal with a world that is changing, and that we are changing; yet I will not treat of what we ‘should’ do, but purely of the science of how to do it – be the goal to erect giant pyramids sculpted in the middle of deserts or by carving entire planets throughout the cosmos and any such show of our devotion to the gods, be it making a world of our arbitrary moral ‘justice’ and equality or be it the very different goal of improving the quality of life of humankind forever on.

Whatever the goal is they all require the same thing; power. On the most literal sense of the world; the capacity to accomplish something – which, by definition, is what is requisite before anything is brought to pass.

As Romulus taught the Caenians; vain, without power, ire is⁶ – and so is all good intention.

No matter how much devoted one is to his gods, without mathematics and architectural engineering he cannot build grand monuments in their honour; no matter how much we love and wish to save those close to us from cancer and death, without knowledge in medicine and the proper tools we have no hope of doing anything that will accomplish our goal – and so too trying to end misery and poverty is a worse than fruitless endeavour without the mastery of the governmental sciences.

⁶ “Sed effuse uastantibus fit obuius cum exercitu Romulus leuique certamine docet uanam sine viribus iram esse.”

– Ab Urbe Condita, From the Founding of the City, I: I.

Science will not tell us ‘the meaning of life’ or force us to choose a certain path; it is no more and no less than the pure comprehension of how the world works – and thus the steps necessary to achieve our goal, to which our defective sciences or pure guesswork have attempted not only in vain but most often with disastrous consequences increase that which they supposedly tried to eradicate.

Now the manner of our inquiry is very simple; we will consider the popular ideas of ‘equality’, the everlasting attempts at authoritarian social communities and our more modern savagery of a falsely free market – and analyse under scientific scrutiny how they fail to accomplish their goal, and what that bountiful collection of experiences in many government tells us about the proper art of politics.

To start let us go upon one of the first distinction learnt on a modern macro or micro Economy class; that of normativism and positivism, which I will mostly use ‘moralism’ for the former and ‘science’ for an extension of the latter – I will therefore mainly show why Science is to be taken rather than blind mindless guesswork in considering the consequences of each method.

For example ‘moralism’ is saying ‘a lion should only eat meat’ and also ‘a lion should only eat grass’; these two opposite parties then say ‘why is that so?’ and all we get from their exchange is the endlessly yelling of their opinion at each other to the detriment of all – which opinions we cannot even say that they are wrong, but that not asserting anything in reality they simply have no sense.⁷

Positivism, on the other hand, asserts ‘if the lion eats only meat it will be healthier’ and also ‘if the lion eats only grass it will be less aggressive’; the lion might be sick from eating only meat and it might be angrier at eating grass which it lacks the intestinal biota to digest, but the point is that some assertion was made about reality which we can test and confirm or deny – quite the contrary of the moralism one which, once again, is a stupid waste of breath since ‘should’ is a mere absurd incoherent of all meaning that tells us simply about his fantasies of what he ‘feels to be right’ rather than any factual and tangible aspect of reality.

⁷ “For there can be no certainty of the last conclusion without a certainty of all those affirmations and negations on which it was grounded and inferred.

...

I should not say he were in an error, but that his words were without meaning; that is to say, absurd.”
– Leviathan I: V.

On those two phrases we could then ask ‘what does it mean that it ‘should’?’ and so descend into pure philosophy; in arguing about what is Virtue and what reflects the perfect forms of Right and Wrong – which only conclusions, of the Soul and thus the divine will that determinates such values, are purely metaphysical and if the reader holds any interest or confusion upon such fancies I destroy them halfway through On the Origin of Subatomic Species.

Actual science then, going a step further, does not simply asserts some random thing and verifies if their guess works or not; which simplistic view is thoroughly shown to be flawed at the first attempts as every subject will show results in differing degrees and rather than accepting one random assertion as the cause we soon learn that it is some extremely complex phenomenon with dozens of factors influencing it in differing degrees – that then is Science, the building of a framework of the world.

Thusly it rather asks ‘what effects has the ingestion of meat in the metabolism of the lion?’ and beyond any opinion or doubt our investigation will simply detail the chemical processes and biological pathways involved so that we can know what results will be produced by meat or grass or another kind of plant or wood or artificial feed produced from many things; we then choose to feed meat, grass or whatsoever will produce the result we truly desire to achieve – likewise when the lion is sick Science does not guess that some herb will fix it or pray for the favour of the gods to descend upon it as miracles, but it can affirm what disruption of the metabolism that disease is and what is needed to fix it.

Modern Economics is based on such positivist assertions, although most often ignored since the rest of our political system is well below in its progress; this Science described above, then, is an extension of that random positivism and is the result of so much trial and error in discarding wrong ideas and selecting further for that have been found to work – but we can go still one step further in extending the implications of that Science and through that Method of ascertaining the validity of assertions we can with our honed foresight artificially select that beneficial improvement rather than continuing on our blind selection.

Science tell us the results of some disturbance to a system, but as a disease rages on through the population or as the meaty prey becomes rarer or the savannah grassland turns back into forests or the earth axis covers the Sahara green once again we know which lions will better resist the pathogen or the advantage of those better able to digest grass or those better suited to climbing the new forest environment or running across the new fertile plains; we can tell which will live and die and how that species will change by the compound causes and effects of each of those scientific facts we have ascertained.

Thus if our goal is nothing more than to have lions that eat grass we cannot just force grass down their throat or if we want to end poverty to just throw money at the poor; in one case the lions we wanted alive will just die and in the other the poverty we wanted extinguished will just grow, with nothing but a greater misery ensuing from our foolish actions that came from simplistic fantasies of ‘opinion’ – it is only through that exact science that we obtain knowledge of reality in what steps we have to take in order to produce that final goal, but even if we directly engineer the genetics of the lions so they may eat grass or if we eradicate misery the lions will evolve back to their former station and misery will rise once again unless we also have that environment that continuously selects for such stable desired final state.

As said Power, the capacity to accomplish something, is our goal in our politics; to become more knowledgeable and acquire the tools that will make it possible to make our intention a reality – we must then govern with the purpose of creating that environment that selects for such most optimal increase of our Power, but for the sake of simplicity and relatedness I will assume the general purpose of that Power to be the general improvement on the quality of life, since that good of humankind and its Power converge into one as the former depends on the later to produce and secure it, so that we may more easily frame our examples.⁸

I could go on almost endlessly on the great lessons exemplified in history and the many most pleasant or distasteful anecdotes that accompany them, but I did not go on about every animal in Natural History and much less will do so with every character in History; rather once again I will treat of their niche – the general strategy and method they have approached government.

Showing the distinction of the good ideas which have been selected because of the benefit they provide to us, which are those of science, and then of that selection that has happened because the idea was beneficial to itself rather than to us; as the sweet lies which so trigger ours brains with simple magical solutions and thus propagate themselves as a virus from people to people by mouth.

I will mainly criticize common models in how they are moralist devoid of all science and sense, and show how they err or get it right on the rare occasions they do assert something; how our most common bi-partite ‘ideologies’ not only fall flat from reality lacking in all rationality and how even if their plan were realized it would produce an unhappy world far from the dreamt utopia they set to make.

⁸ “Wealth, population and power are, after all, only valuable, as they tend to improve, increase, and secure the mass of human virtue and happiness.”

– Observations on the Effects of the Corn Laws, but which on his Principles of Political Economy he goes into depth about finding ‘a proper definition to Wealth’; and here my point is that all, or any other nomenclature, is meaningless before the only actual parameters which is the gained capacity to accomplish something, viz ‘Power’.

II – Enquiry Into Equality

History is not about the memorization of some names and dates, as most ‘teachers’ think, but the comprehension of all the forces and events which shaped the present we live in⁹.

Such vicissitudes of destiny which appear before our eyes as ‘historic events’ present the biological succession of how this social biome changed; not only in showing how the wealth of Zhou did not appear from nowhere, but also as mirrors so that we may examine our form¹⁰ – lenses which not only allow us to properly study the constituent parts of the past to understand the present, but also making it clearly visible the results of the historical succession of the present in what future it will beget since the present instant is a gift from the preceding instant and the giver of the instants to follow¹¹.

Thus let us start with one of the oldest, and best, writings we have: “Those who acquire ability and knowledge succeed better than those ignorant; the laborious have better results than the otiose – and the most diligent who live with more care and reason have more safety than the negligent and careless.”¹²; so beautifully puts Ksenophon in the mouth of Cambyzes with all the simplicity and

⁹ “Der Unterricht über Weltgeschichte in den sogenannten Mittelschulen liegt nun freilich auch heute noch sehr imargen. Wenige Lehrer begreifen, daß das Ziel gerade des geschichtlichen Unterrichtes nie und nimmer im Auswendig-lernen und Herunterhaspeln geschichtlicher Daten und Er-eignisse liegen kann; daß es nicht darauf ankommt, ob der Junge nun genau weiß, wann dies oder jene Schlacht ge-schlagen, ein Feldherr geboren wurde, oder gar ein (mei-stens sehr unbedeutender) Monarch die Krone seiner Ahnen auf das Haupt gesetzt erhielt. Nein, wahrhafter Gott, darauf kommt es wenig an.

Geschichte „lernen“ heißt die Kräfte suchen und finden, die als Ursachen zu jenen Wirkungen führen, die wir dann als geschichtliche Ereignisse vor unseren Augen sehen.

Die Kunst des Lesens wie des Lemens ist auch hier: Wesentliches behalten, Unwesentliches ver-gessen.”

– Mein Kampf, My Struggle, I.

¹⁰ “孔子觀乎明堂，觀四門墉有堯舜與桀紂之象，而各有善惡之狀、興廢之誠焉；又有周公相成王，抱之負斧戾南面以朝諸侯之圖焉。孔子徘徊而望之，謂從者曰：「此周公所以盛也。夫明鏡所以察形，往古者所以知今；人主不務襲迹於其所以安存，而急急所以危亡，是猶未有以異於卻走而欲求及前人也，豈不惑哉！」”

–家語：觀周, Jiayu: Guan Zhou, II, where Qiu comments of Zhou; studying the past success in order to properly produce an equally successful future.

¹¹ “Mais le résultat que chaque instant présente dépend de celui qu’offroient les instans précédens, et influe sur celui des temps qui doivent suivre.”

– Esquisse d'un Tableau Historique des Progrès de l'Esprit Humain: Introduction, Sketch of a Historical Picture of the Progresses of the Human Mind: Introduction.

¹² “Τί γάρ, ἔφη, ὃ παῖ, μέμνησαι ἐκεῖνα ἃ ποτε ἐδόκει ἡμῖν, ὥς ἄπερ δεδώκασιν οἱ θεοὶ μαθόντας ἀνθρώπους βέλτιον πράττειν ἢ ἀνεπιστήμονας αὐτῶν ὄντας καὶ ἐργαζομένους μᾶλλον ἀνύτειν ἢ ἀργοῦντας καὶ ἐπιμελουμένους ἀσφαλέστερον ἂν διαίγειν ἢ ἀφυλακτοῦντας τούτων, –παρέχοντας οὖν τοιούτους ἑαυτοῦς

absolute clarity of his style – putting this principle forward not simply on Economy, but in all aspects of life.

Next he puts on the mouth of son, the great king, that how unfair then would equality be for all to harvest the same thing when each produce different results; ‘Or is it not impiety to pray to the gods asking victory on the rodeo when he never rode an animal and the golden medal in archery when he never shot or all other superiority over all those who have knowledge on that which he never trained? Not less sinful is to ask to have a good harvest when he did not even sowed or that he have health and any goods of comfort when he, differently from the diligent ones, did not macerate his drinking to take care of his body neither controlled his expenditure in pleasures to amount for future benefits.’¹³ – so that being impossible to force the inapt to succeed the only way would be to force all to fail, and take away their freedom to perform any different actions so that they may have the same equality of results.

This is called ‘geometrical equality’ where each is thus reward in proportion to what they do rather than the absolute homogeneity of ‘arithmetical equality’ where all have exactly the same reward regardless of what they do; a basic moral principle agreed to by most, and through which most people promptly reject that absolute equality as rather than ‘fair’ to be immoral and wrong – yet let us consider how, if our goal is absolute homogeneity of wealth between all individuals of society, it could be achieved and the results of it.

I find fit to start with this most trivial and simplistic theme, since it is so wide spread to those who want to have an opinion, supported purely by its own ignorant convictions, without the trouble to actually thinking about it to either develop how such a system could possibly be put into practice or the consequences if such bizarrerie were to exist; I was even conflicted if I should do something so wasteful as to treat of this magnitude of stupidity when no one who has had a single thought considering the subject would endorse it – yet, by the nauseating ubiquity of calls to fight against ‘inequality’ I am convinced it is truly needed to start here.

οἷους δεῖ, οὕτως ἡμῖν ἐδόκει δεῖν καὶ αἰτεῖσθαι τάγαθὰ παρὰ τῶν θεῶν;”

– Κύρου Παιδεία, Cyropædia, I: 6: 5, but I paraphrase both this and the next rather than an actual quote.

¹³ “Ναὶ μὰ Δί’, ἔφη ὁ Κύρος, μέννημαί μέντοι τοιαῦτα ἀκούσας σου: καὶ γὰρ ἀνάγκη με πείθεσθαι τῷ λόγῳ: καὶ γὰρ οἶδά σε λέγοντα αἰεὶ ὡς οὐδὲ θέμις εἶη αἰτεῖσθαι παρὰ τῶν θεῶν οὔτε ἵππεύειν μὴ μαθόντας ἵππομαχοῦντας νικᾶν, οὔτε μὴ ἐπισταμένους τοξεύειν τοξεύοντας κρατεῖν τῶν ἐπισταμένων, οὔτε μὴ ἐπισταμένους κυβερνᾶν σώζειν εὖχεσθαι ναῦς κυβερνῶντας, οὐδὲ μὴ στείροντάς γε σῖτον εὖχεσθαι καλὸν αὐτοῖς φύεσθαι, οὐδὲ μὴ φυλαττομένους γε ἐν πολέμῳ σωτηρίαν αἰτεῖσθαι: παρὰ γὰρ τοὺς τῶν θεῶν θεσμούς πάντα τὰ τοιαῦτα εἶναι: τοὺς δὲ ἀθέμιτα εὐχομένους ὁμοίως ἔφησθα εἰκὸς εἶναι παρὰ θεῶν ἀτυχεῖν ὥσπερ καὶ παρὰ ἀνθρώπων ἀπρακεῖν τοὺς παράνομα δεομένους.”

– Κύρου Παιδεία, Ciropédia, I: 6: 6.

‘Geometrical equality’ is often called ‘meritocracy’ nowadays where each receive based upon some agreed ‘merit’, but which most deny that to be the case; and most ancient works then focus solely on ‘morality’ and discuss thus what is the perfect form of ‘virtue’ that should measure that ‘merit’ – but before that let actual discussion let us treat here of this lowest point of baseless guesswork about ‘absolute equality’ with no division of ‘poor’ and ‘rich’ with no one being at some station in life any worse or better than anyone else.

A common entrance-point into to these views is in how ‘it cannot be right a system where a footballer receives so many times more to play a game than a doctor to save a life’ or how ‘CEOs do nothing and hold ninety nine per cent of the world wealthy while people who actually work hard everyday like masons get just the minimum to survive’; let us see then how the current world organized to be that way to see what parameters we could change to try to set it to some desired different result.

I once observed a ship engineer and his friend, who having absolutely no qualification was left to operate the awful bilge pump during travel; awful both as the illegal practice so harmful to the environment and as literally barely functional – so that at dinner I spied their conversation where the pump operator complained about wanting equal treatments, since he worked a sweat trying to keep the pump working and got his shirt stained all over while his friend merely ‘chilled’ at the deck and bridge. While all his hard work got him the most basic wage and accommodations in contrast to his friend receiving many times more and other advantages for ‘doing nothing or some simple typing and drawing’.

The friend laughing asked if his abilities and functions are also equal to his for him to receive the same; and basically that it is not possible to produce the same result through different components.

To which the operator just laughed slyly too, before the friend got more serious asking if he was also ready to take on the same responsibility handling the life of all sailors and his own which would depend on the exactness of his calculators to determinate the alterations to fix the ship; and besides the moral weight he went on into the many possible fines of many times what he makes on a single job in case he made a mistake or merely failed to achieved the promised improvement – which was followed by a very nice remark asking if he was ready to be condemned and thrown in jail for the reason of still being unable to foresee the future and thus not warning about some unexpected extreme events of earthquakes and rogue waves, which was a jab at the outrageous condemnation of six seismologists for homicide in L'Aquila after they reported the reality that they saw no signs of any incoming.

After that the conversation went downhill with him morally bragging about how in reality the ‘irresponsible floor-washers’ receive much more if he is to weight the actual contributions and responsibilities of each party; in how then the contributions that his friend can make are such menial work, and that the fault is in the life choices of his friend, while his contributions can

instead save dozens of times more what he received on each trip of the ship because of the increased efficiency, less costs of repairs and so on – but most interesting what the point he was trying to get, that ‘effort’ was completely irrelevant and rather a show of how inefficient and incapacitated someone is in producing something useful so that only the results were worth something.

And so he ended up saying how he actually should be paid much more; and if his ‘easy’ work seated in a cool room begot a greater positive good than the work of fifty people working hard sweating under the sun then it was only right that he should receive in accordance to his contributions and more than all of them together.

Quite roundabout, insolent and self-righteous, but we will treat of that ‘right’ to something or ‘merit’ later; for now let us extract this insight into how salaries work – it is, obviously, the offer and demand for certain works that dictate the price of each good, but let us go into this ‘moral’ view that leads to inequality as ‘right’.

His claim is that only the results produced matter, not any ‘effort’ or the like; we ask then, is there anyone who pays his wages based on the intentions of the worker and not on the service done?

A carpenter do not really want to give his furniture to others or drivers carry people around, but merely work to make a living; but if we hire someone to fix a small leak on our roof and he, on his intention to make a living and fix it, ends up bringing down our ceiling, breaking our furniture and burning out all our electronic with the flood from the pipes he broke – would we still pay him? Or what if some thief steals and murders just for that same intention to make a living, and that can be quite a lot more effort than a normal job; is there any who judges then all to be the same then and who will pay for that ‘intention’ rather than the result from that work?¹¹

“彭更問曰：「後車數十乘，從者數百人，以傳食於諸侯，不以泰乎？」

孟子曰：「非其道，則一簞食不可受於人；如其道，則舜受堯之天下，不以為泰，子以為泰乎？」

曰：「否。士無事而食，不可也。」

曰：「子不通功易事，以羨補不足，則農有餘粟，女有餘布；子如通之，則梓匠輪輿皆得食於子。於此有人焉，入則孝，出則悌，守先王之道，以待後之學者，而不得食於子。子何尊梓匠輪輿而輕為仁義者哉？」

曰：「梓匠輪輿，其志將以求食也；君子之為道也，其志亦將以求食與？」

曰：「子何以其志為哉？其有功於子，可食而食之矣。且子食志乎？食功乎？」

曰：「食志。」

曰：「有人於此，毀瓦畫墁，其志將以求食也，則子食之乎？」

曰：「否。」

曰：「然則子非食志也，食功也。」”

- 孟子: 滕文公, Meng Zi Teng Wen Gong, II: 9, I make a most violent addition to the dialogue where Ke so beautifully argues about the house breaking and that thus all pay not for the ‘intention’, but the work performed.

And that is common moral argument for inequality; where some free people to make choices about what they want to buy and what they want to offer determinate the prices – the world we mostly have today.

Let us go step by step through that process and think on the consequences of each change; there is no ‘system’ as some giant evil antagonism controlled by some mastermind, but simply a set of axioms from which basic rules all the rest is elicited.

So we wake up in the morning and decide to go to work; that is, we will produce something that someone wants and exchange that for something that we want.

A friend of ours, then, wake up in the morning, but is he forced to go to work? And is his forced to go to work doing the same thing as we do? Or can he choose to rest and spend his day lying about on the grass?

Most will probably say that each person can do what so ever they want; that ‘freedom is a basic human right’ or things like that.

Will our friend then, who spent his die frolicking on the grass, receive the same salary as us?

Most will to promptly say that it cannot be; rather than equality that ‘it is unfair to receive it without working’.

Is there anything in this situation that should be changed?

The freedom of choice leads to different outcomes; that is, each person will ‘deserve’ a different result.

Some then may say that the problem is those who gain more than them; they have no mind to pay to those poorer than them – as if unfairness is about there existing those at a better condition than them, so that it is common to estipulate a simple law that ‘only those who work are paid their wages’.

Then let us look at our friend again who instead of just lying about decided to get some paper or a canvas, or even just mud, and make a work of art out of it. Are people forced to buy it? Or do they only buy it if they want it? Who has to pay that friend of ours his ‘wage’ for that work? What if he instead decided to ‘work’ by bringing together a bunch of blades of grass or making holes on the ground; who will pay for that heavy work he is doing?

If we go on this dialogue will some random people on the street they would be thoroughly exasperated at this questioning of their ‘common sense’, but if they deign to answer they should say something akin to ‘only those who want it will buy it’ and that ‘work has to be something useful’ – all while yelling at us that we are making up problems that do not exist in reality.

But then we have to ask; who judges what is 'useful'?

God?

The government?

These simple events are a hint to the fact that all such concept of 'pay', 'merit', 'usefulness' and all other words used are completely arbitrary and furnish no more than an ambiguous view rather than a rigorous definition; which lose all sense when truly scrutinized and analysed in view of reality – the answer we arrived here is that the only way for equality is for the government, or whoever defines 'usefulness', to force everyone to work in what they themselves chose to 'be useful', or then to pay even to those who do nothing.

Which one is good, or at least an improvement of our situation?

The former is the idea of communism that we will treat on the next chapter, and which is so repulsive to our sense of freedom; the later seems even more immoral than our 'problem of inequality'.

Something bad happening to a good person is as saddening and hateful as something good happening to a bad person; rather than 'equality' of the same thing happening to all it is 'the due reward' to each that virtually every author has treated about.

But let us go on in our attempt at absolute equality.

Our friend having his sculpture or painting the answer was that no one is forced to buy it; simply who wants it – rather than the government or any central authority people naturally leave to the free market to decide what is useful to them and what any price is worth.

And so we see ten people lining up for that artwork; one offers fifty monetary units while other offer sixty. Is our friend forced to sell it only for the value of what we gain in a day of work, since he made it within a single day?

What if it only took a few minutes, and not the entire day, should he sell then for less than what they are paying?

But to whom out of the ten people should he sell it?

All of them want it, but it is not possible to 'have equality' and all of them have it; there is only one of that artwork – and if the ten could have it, what about the 'equality' of all others who do not even want it? Should everyone be forced to have it since one person wants and have it, so that they all become 'equal'?

Of course the government would have to come again into the scene to enforce that and force everyone to abide to that price; since even if he sell it for a day work, fifty, because of his beliefs in equality, who would stop the buyer from selling it for another for a hundred? Is he forced to also sell it for fifty? Does that count as a work day for him, transporting the artwork to another hand? And to whom is that being sold, to the first who made an offer?

What if our friend does not want to sell it, but even so people want to pay money just to go to his house see it; is he forced to let them enter his house for free or can they not even see it since paying for entrance would make him more rich than other people?

We can see this quickly evolving into our current system and how people by their wants for some limited product, that is offer and demand, define the concentration of wealth; and in any point of that process in which we interfere to force ‘equality’ things turn into a despotic nightmare instantly.

Many justify saying that ‘being an artist is risky’ or that ‘investing is risky’ so that ‘they can get rich, but they can also do all of that for nothing’ or that ‘he got rich with a single song or painting, but that took years of studying and investment in training and hard work while you were lazing around’ as if that increased their ‘merit’ or moral criteria for receiving wealth, but of course that is just more of the ambiguous meaningless words of purely imaginary morals as before, now simply from the opposing party, that have no use in this actual analysis of reality in how value is produced and accrued.

So let us move the scene one step deeper; and let us ourselves take one step back and rather than participating on it to arbiter between two parties – for it does not matter what is ‘good for us’ personally or what we ‘think it should be’, but the State has to considers the actual results of each regulation and so make them for the general good of the nation and not of any individual or group.

‘It is for base men to think on the conform and favours they will receive instead of having in mind the virtue and effects of the law’¹⁵; and before any actual consideration of the science of Economy and Politics we must understand it is not from ‘our’ point of view included within, but that of the Government managing society from above for the sole goal of improving the State.

We have now before us two farmers who work on planting their farms.

One choose to plant in two fields while the other preferred to plant one field and erect some protective structure upon that one field.

¹⁵ “子曰：「君子之於天下也，無適也，無莫也，義之與比。」”

– 論語：里仁，Lunyü: Li Ren, XI.

Will they receive the same if the other has double the things to sell? Or should they receive the same and one farmer then have the advantage of having that building as a bonus since he would gain nothing planting and producing more?

How could we produce 'equality' out of that? Is his building the own reward for his work and equivalent to the extra money the other received for his fruits, as the 'justice' of the free market without us interfering in anything?

What if there is a storm and the one who worked so much planting two fields is left with nothing; and the one who built his protection has his fruit to sell. How will they receive now?

What is 'equality'?

The 'justice' of the free market is clear; he produced nothing and contributed nothing to society, and so society does not have to pay anything to him – no one pays for 'intentions'.

At this point many protest, and so wide spreads are social programs, that 'the right answer cannot possibly be to let he on his own to die of hunger', but of course it does not go beyond such mindless 'should be' protest with no real analysis of the results that changes would do that that system; and to put it explicitly that 'he should not have the freedom to deal with the consequences of his life choices'.

Yet, the 'moral' being meaningless, we as the State simply have to ask; do we pay the same or both farmers who worked all season long even if one produced nothing? And who is paying for that production of nothing?

The other receiving his equal pay he will use that money to eat and survive, but on the market now we only have that single produce from one farmer; is it 'equality' to divide that produce between the two of them and deprive the first farmer from half of his produce to give to the one who produced nothing?

What if both produce nothing? Who is paying for it, and what is there left even to be paid?

What about a third farmer who only plants a tenth of his single field, but who takes the utmost care of his produce; is he forced to sell that at the same price as the produce of others and go hungry by the fewness of it or is he free to ask whatever he wants and selling each unit for much more than a low-quality unit to get more money than the one who planted two whole fields?

What if he sees his neighbour who did not treat his field against plague to be in ruins, should he perform violence upon his own field so that they will maintain equality?

Or as his harvest grows should he go around cutting the head of the largest grains and go about flaying the best ears rich in corn so that they will be the same size as the others? And should we

ostracize the farmer who dare to break the mould and produce unequally more than the average?¹⁶

¹⁶ “εἰ δέ τις ἔστιν εἷς τοσοῦτον διαφέρων κατ’ ἀρετῆς ὑπερβολήν, ἢ πλείους μὲν ἐνὸς μὴ μέντοι δυνατοὶ πληρῶμα παρασχέσθαι πόλεως, ὥστε μὴ συμβλητὴν εἶναι τὴν τῶν ἄλλων ἀρετὴν πάντων μηδὲ τὴν δύναμιν αὐτῶν τὴν πολιτικὴν πρὸς τὴν ἐκείνων, εἰ πλείους, εἰ δ’ εἷς, τὴν ἐκείνου μόνον, οὐκέτι θετόν τούτους μέρους πόλεως· ἀδικήσονται γὰρ ἀξιούμενοι τῶν ἴσων, ἄνισοι τοσοῦτον κατ’ ἀρετὴν ὄντες καὶ τὴν πολιτικὴν δύναμιν· ὥσπερ γὰρ θεὸν ἐν ἀνθρώποις εἰκὸς εἶναι τὸν τοιοῦτον. ὁθεν δὴλον ὅτι καὶ τὴν νομοθεσίαν ἀναγκαῖον εἶναι περὶ τοὺς ἴσους καὶ τῷ γένει καὶ τῇ δυνάμει, κατὰ δὲ τῶν τοιούτων οὐκ ἔστι νόμος· αὐτοὶ γὰρ εἰσι νόμοι. καὶ γὰρ γελοῖος ἂν εἴη νομοθετεῖν τις πειρώμενος κατ’ αὐτὸν. λέγοιεν γὰρ ἂν ἴσως ἅπερ Ἀντισθένης ἔφη τοὺς λέοντας δημηγορούντων τῶν δασυπόδων καὶ τὸ ἴσον ἀξιούντων πάντας ἔχειν. διὸ καὶ τίθενται τὸν ὀστρακισμόν αἱ δημοκρατούμεναι πόλεις, διὰ τὴν τοιαύτην αἰτίαν· αὐταὶ γὰρ δὴ δοκοῦσι διώκειν τὴν ἰσότητα μάλιστα πάντων, ὥστε τοὺς δοκοῦντας ὑπερέχειν δυνάμει διὰ πλοῦτον ἢ πολυφιλίαν ἢ τινα ἄλλην πολιτικὴν ἰσχὺν ὠστράκιζον καὶ μεθίστασαν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως χρόνους ὠρισμένους. μυθολογεῖται δὲ καὶ τοὺς Ἀργοναύτας τὸν Ἡρακλέα καταλιπεῖν διὰ τοιαύτην αἰτίαν· οὐ γὰρ ἐθέλειν αὐτὸν ἄγειν τὴν Ἀργὴ μετὰ τῶν πλωτήρων τῶν ἄλλων, ὥς ὑπερβάλλοντα πολὺ. διὸ καὶ τοὺς ψέγοντας τὴν τυραννίδα καὶ τὴν Περιάνδρου Θρασυβούλῃ συμβουλίαν οὐχ ἀπλῶς οἰητέον ὀρθῶς ἐπιτιμᾶν (φασὶ γὰρ τὸν Περιάνδρον εἰπεῖν μὲν οὐδὲν πρὸς τὸν πεμφθέντα κήρυκα περὶ τῆς συμβουλίας, ἀφαιρούντα δὲ τοὺς ὑπερέχοντας τῶν σταχυόν ὁμαλῶναι τὴν ἄρουραν· ὁθεν ἀγνοοῦντος μὲν τοῦ κήρυκος τοῦ γιγνομένου τὴν αἰτίαν, ἀπαγγελλαντος δὲ τὸ συμπεσόν, συνοησάμενος τὸν Θρασύβουλον ὅτι δεῖ τοὺς ὑπερέχοντας ἄνδρας ἀναιρεῖν). τοῦτο γὰρ οὐ μόνον συμφέρει τοῖς τυράννοις, οὐδὲ μόνον οἱ τύραννοι ποιοῦσιν, ἀλλ’ ὁμοίως ἔχει καὶ περὶ τὰς ὀλιγαρχίας καὶ τὰς δημοκρατίας· ὁ γὰρ ὀστρακισμὸς τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχει δύναμιν τρόπον τινὰ τῷ κολοῦειν τοὺς ὑπερέχοντας καὶ φυγαδεύειν. τὸ δ’ αὐτὸ καὶ περὶ τὰς πόλεις καὶ τὰ ἔθνη ποιοῦσιν οἱ κύριοι τῆς δυνάμεως, οἷον Ἀθηναῖοι μὲν περὶ Σαμίου καὶ Χίου καὶ Λεσβίου (ἐπεὶ γὰρ θάττον ἐγκρατῶς ἔσχον τὴν ἀρχήν, ἐταπεινώσαν αὐτοὺς παρὰ τὰς συνθήκας), ὁ δὲ Περσῶν βασιλεὺς Μήδους καὶ Βαβυλωνίους καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τοὺς πεφρονηματομένους διὰ τὸ γενέσθαι ποτ’ ἐπ’ ἀρχῆς ἐπέκοπτε πολλάκις.”

- Πολιτικά, Politics, III, where Aristotle goes about the literal policy of ostracism; a thing used by democratic States and tyrants alike in order to get rid of their most outstanding individuals in order to maintain that false sense of equality of all or unchallenged absolute power by having none gain any influence or prosperity.

“ὁ τοῖνον Περιάνδρος κατ’ ἀρχὰς μὲν ἦν ἡπιώτερος τοῦ πατρός, ἐπεὶ δὲ ὠμίλησε δι’ ἀγγέλων Θρασυβούλῃ τῷ Μιλήτῳ τυράννῳ, πολλῶν ἔτι ἐγένετο Κυνέλου μαιφρονώτερος. πέμψας γὰρ παρὰ Θρασύβουλον κήρυκα ἐπυνθάνετο ὅντινα ἂν τρόπον ἀσφαλέστατον καταστησάμενος τῶν πρηγμάτων κάλλιστα τὴν πόλιν ἐπιτροπεύοι. Θρασύβουλος δὲ τὸν ἐλθόντα παρὰ τοῦ Περιάνδρου ἐξῆγε ἔξω τοῦ ἄστεος, ἐσβάς δὲ ἐς ἄρουραν ἐσπαρμένην ἅμα τε διεξῆμε τὸ λήιον ἐπειρωτῶν τε καὶ ἀναποδίζων τὸν κήρυκα κατὰ τὴν ἀπὸ Κορίνθου ἁπίζιν, καὶ ἐκόλουε αἰεὶ ὅκως τινὰ ἴδοι τῶν ἀσταχυόν ὑπερέχοντα, κολουῶν δὲ ἐρρίπτει, ἐς τὸ τοῦ ληίου τὸ κάλλιστόν τε καὶ βαθύτατον διέφθειρε τρόπον τοιούτῳ· διεξελεθὼν δὲ τὸ χωρίον καὶ ὑποθέμενος ἔπος οὐδὲν ἀποπέμπτει τὸν κήρυκα. νοστήσαντος δὲ τοῦ κήρυκος ἐς τὴν Κόρινθον ἦν πρόθυμος πυνθάνεσθαι τὴν ὑποθήκην ὁ Περιάνδρος· ὁ δὲ οὐδὲν οἱ ἔφη Θρασύβουλον ὑποθέσθαι, θωμάζειν τε αὐτοῦ παρ’ οἷον μιν ἄνδρα ἀποπέμψει, ὥς παραπλήγῃ τε καὶ τῶν ἐνυτοῦ συνάμωρον, ἀπηγεόμενος τὰ περ πρὸς Θρασυβούλου δῶτάππεε.

Περιάνδρος δὲ συνιείς τὸ ποιηθὲν καὶ νόφ’ ἴσχων ὥς οἱ ὑπετίθετο Θρασύβουλος τοὺς ὑπειρόχους τῶν ἀστῶν φονεῦν, ἐνθαῦτα δὴ πᾶσαν κακότητα ἐξέφαινε ἐς τοὺς πολῖτας.”

- Ιστορίαι, Histories, V: 92, although Herodotus says that Periander learnt from Thrasybulus, which is the opposite of what Aristoteles says, the silent example of going around the field cutting the tallest and biggest ears of corn.

We are thrown on endless, and meaningless, difficulties when we try to uphold such ambiguous term in real life; all words are arbitrary, and not some correspondence to some perfect Platonic form, and unless we rigorously define them beforehand they are of no use to such exact operations – and if we completely ignore such terms we can simply see the reality of the results we are left with.

And so we arrive at the answer that much on the contrary it is the bigger ears that we want to cultivate further and for the best farmer to rule over the fields on the best way possible.

And so it is by no guesswork or ‘opinion’ that we solve questions as ‘A farmer plants on the proper time and sells his production; yet would another who had the same work and intention, but which his foolishness led him to plant it on the winter where all plants to die, but had nothing to sell?’ or ‘The farmer waits patiently for the rice to grow until the time of harvest, but what if one has a good intention of wanting to make them grow faster or even bigger and goes on pulling up the plants; should he be paid for his extra services and good intention, or even be paid, when all his hard work was only a harm destroying the harvest?’¹⁷; we rather affirm that such behaviour is certainly not beneficial to society and causing only harm feeds no one; and the encouraging of which would destroy any State instead of leading to a good and prosperous life to its inhabitants.

‘Seeing the impious being promoted demotivates the just, but the contrary cultivates justice in all’; is a very common phrase that summarizes what Ksenophon was saying at the beginning of this chapter – and a ubiquitous one throughout cultures, although they had no idea of how truly right they were in the exact economic principle of selection of such rather than that empty morality¹⁸.

¹⁷ “曰：「難言也。其為氣也，至大至剛，以直養而無害，則塞于天地之間。其為氣也，配義與道；無是，餒也。是集義所生者，非義襲而取之也。行有不慊於心，則餒矣。我故曰，告子未嘗知義，以其外之也。必有事焉而勿正，心勿忘，勿助長也。無若宋人然：宋人有閔其苗之不長而揠之者，芒芒然歸。謂其人曰：『今日病矣，予助苗長矣。』其子趨而往視之，苗則槁矣。天下之不助苗長者寡矣。以為無益而舍之者，不耘苗者也；助之長者，揠苗者也。非徒無益，而又害之。」”

– 孟子：公孫丑, Meng Zi: Gong Sun Chou, I: 2.

¹⁸ “哀公問曰：「何為則民服？」孔子對曰：「舉直錯諸枉，則民服；舉枉錯諸直，則民不服。」”

– 論語：為政, Lunyu: Wei Zheng, XIX.

“樊遲問仁。子曰：「愛人。」問知。子曰：「知人。」樊遲未達。子曰：「舉直錯諸枉，能使枉者直。」樊遲退，見子夏。曰：「鄉也吾見於夫子而問知，子曰，『舉直錯諸枉，能使枉者直』，何謂也？」子夏曰：「富哉言乎！舜有天下，選於眾，舉皋陶，不仁者遠矣。湯有天下，選於眾，舉伊尹，不仁者遠矣。」”

– 論語：顏淵, Lunyu: Yan Yuan, XXII, which is the one I quoted there.

“Id adeo non plebis quam patrum neque tribunorum magis quam consulum culpa accidere. Cuius rei praemium sit in civitate, eam maximis semper auctibus crescere; sic pace bonos, sic bello fieri. Maximum Romae praemium seditionum esse; ideo singulis universisque semper honori fuisse.”

Every government desire for treasures, a large population and safety; yet so often they acquire not wealth but poverty, not a multitude but scarcity and not order but chaos – losing that which they desire and obtaining what they dread. Why is that?¹⁹

If we want good archers or drivers it is clear that we will not achieve such by despising them and punishing them in our kingdom, but by paying them well, honouring them, respecting them and praising them; what thrives is that which is cultivated – even in ‘equality’ one spend more exertion than others to achieve the same reward, and thus it is the optimal and most fit strategy to do the minimum they can for that same reward.

That is what our equalitarian State cultivates; if we cross the impossibilities and contradictions to set it up in the first place.

- Ab Urbe Condita, From the Founding of the City, IV: 2, saying how Rome honoring evil deeds and traits leads to it being so common and widespread; it is what they, the environment they created, select for.

“否之匪人，不利君子貞，大往小來。

否之匪人，不利君子貞。大往小來，則是天地不交，而萬物不通也；上下不交，而天下无邦也。內陰而外陽，內柔而外剛，內小人而外君子。小人道長，君子道消也。

天地不交，否；君子以儉德辟難，不可榮以祿。”

- 易經: ䷋ 否, Yi Jing: Pi, I, where even the ancient shows that natural morality and aptitude even when no actual Science and proper argument besides their pure guesswork is made; in how when ‘Tai, worthless men, are put over Pi, the wise, it is as ‘the lack of communication between heavens and earth’ so that the insignificant and chaos grow as the wise disappear, since all glory and reward are only for that other more fit strategy thus increasing it.

¹⁹ “子墨子言曰：「今者王公大人為政於國家者，皆欲國家之富，人民之眾，刑政之治，然而不得富而得貧，不得眾而得寡，不得治而得亂，則是本失其所欲，得其所惡，是其故何也？」

子墨子言曰：「是在王公大人為政於國家者，不能以尚賢事能為政也。是故國有賢良之士眾，則國家之治厚，賢良之士寡，則國家之治薄。故大人之務，將在於眾賢而已。」

曰：「然則眾賢之術將奈何哉？」

子墨子言曰：「譬若欲眾其國之善射御之士者，必將富之，貴之，敬之，譽之，然后國之善射御之士，將可得而眾也。況又有賢良之士厚乎德行，辯乎言談，博乎道術者乎，此固國家之珍，而社稷之佐也，亦必且富之，貴之，敬之，譽之，然后國之良士，亦將可得而眾也。」

- 墨翟: 尚賢, Mo Di: Shangxian, I: 1-4, where so tantalizingly this most foolish man I have ever known scratches at actual Science and Selection; mentioning such failures of the government in achieving their goals and exemplifying with the archers some simplistic unreal environment that selects for the increase of that class.

“Licinius ueteres quoque scribebat milites centurionesque; et multi uoluntate nomina dabant, quia locupletes uidebant, qui priore Macedonico bello aut aduersus Antiochum in Asia stipendia fecerant.”

- Ab Urbe Condita, From the Founding of the City, XLII: 32, where as more simply shown in reality with the third Makedonian war overflowing with volunteers since they saw that those who served on the previous ones were now rich men.

And so it is said that Yao, instead of equality of the virtuous and the vile, promoted Hie and Ho to the highest officer; so they may observe the stars and calculate the duration of the year with the defined time of the seasons – so that they would know now the appropriate time to plant, hunt and all other things²⁰, and thus they prospered in abundance becoming immortal in memory for the contribution forever furnished to humankind.

For a taste of that let us contemplate how the fruits of the agrestic culture are contained between the heavens and earth; the embrace of pater Iupiter e Terra mater – and not far from the Bull is the pestilent animal which pasturing upon surculi destroys all abundance. Always present on the heavens and earth; be them a blessing or a curse²¹.

²⁰ “乃命羲和，欽若昊天，歷象日月星辰，敬授人時。分命羲仲，宅嵎夷，曰暘谷。寅賓出日，平秩東作。日中，星鳥，以殷仲春。厥民析，鳥獸孳尾。申命羲叔，宅南交。平秩南訛，敬致。日永，星火，以正仲夏。厥民因，鳥獸希革。分命和仲，宅西，曰昧谷。寅饒納日，平秩西成。宵中，星虛，以殷仲秋。厥民夷，鳥獸毛毳。申命和叔，宅朔方，曰幽都。平在朔易。日短，星昴，以正仲冬。厥民隩，鳥獸氄毛。帝曰：「咨！汝羲暨和。朞三百有六旬有六日，以閏月定四時，成歲。允釐百工，庶績咸熙。」”

– 尚書：虞書 堯典, Shang Shu: Yu Shu Yao Dian, II.

²¹ “Primum, qui omnis fructos agri culturae caelo et terra continent, Iovem et Tellurem: itaque, quod ii parentes, magni dicuntur, Iuppiter pater appellatur, Tellus terra mater. Secundo Solem et Lunam, quorum tempora observantur, cum quaedam seruntur et conduntur.”

– Rerum Rusticarum de Agri Cultura, About the Things of Cultivating the Field, I: I, which is the base for this following description of the arts of caring for an ancient farmstead

“Agrius, Tu, inquit, tibicen non solum adimis domino pecus, sed etiam servis peculium, quibus domini dant ut pascant, atque etiam leges colonicas tollis, in quibus scribimus, colonus in agro surculario ne capra natum pascat: quas etiam astrologia in caelum recepit, non longe ab tauro. Cui Fundanius, Vide, inquit, ne, Agri, istuc sit ab hoc, cum in legibus etiam scribatur 'pecus quoddam'. Quaedam enim pecudes culturae sunt inimicae ac veneno, ut istae, quas dixisti, caprae.”

– Rerum Rusticarum de Agri Cultura, About the Things of Cultivating the Field, I: II, the funny remark about the environmental engineering made by goats by eating young shoots of trees thus deforesting areas into pastures; something keenly noted by Robert.

“无妄：元亨，利貞。其匪正有眚，不利有攸往。

无妄，剛自外來，而為主於內。動而健，剛中而應，大亨以正，天之命也。其匪正有眚，不利有攸往。无妄之往，何之矣？天命不佑，行矣哉？

天下雷行，物與无妄；先王以茂對時，育萬物。

– 易經：䷘ 无妄, Yi Jing: Wu Wang, I, which equally mentions how all things are under the heavens and that prosperity, as found in the ancient kings, is found is following those heavenly signs; an example of the globalization long ago as cultures convergently developed the same ideas.

Most people perhaps will say then that there is not much a farmer can do; he is either born lucky on that good soil or not, and there is basically nothing that he can do to improve it since it depends solely on the weather and terrain – and while I cannot teach here every possible art and the depth of their complexity, let us take a little look at farming.

The opinion of some farmers is that to have a good harvest the first thing you need is to do some ‘well ploughing’ and in second place to do some ‘ploughing’ and in third ‘manuring’²²; and these simple acts already produce so much more than those who simply throw seeds at random without considering any soil or time – and yet something much better than such instinctive empiric dogmas can be reached.

One of the first things we will find by studying the field is the fact that our majors in a same space produced less and of less quality due to their deficient plans of placement. And so instead of sacrificing to the gods praying for a good harvest they should analyse the best form of disposing their plantations; as trees in quincunx rows where the best space is utilized without the tree blocking the sun, moon or wind one from the others – or as grains a well-made and dispersed broad-cast is much superior to the careless negligent throw of others and almost incomparable to those who produce the tool and tests which is the optimal condition be it on ideal fields with grains twelve centimetres apart or the poorest ones where painful half a meter between each ear certify the best result that the soil supports.

Vines grow better in certain soils, corn in others, olive trees in others and other trees on theirs; and so it befits to be provided of science to know how to identify the different soils as fertile dense loam or cavernous silica where all its nutrients flow between the sand carrying it away together with the water – and so which plants are best to have their roots on each, what combination of biota and fertilizer is necessary to keep such on its best production and which works have to be made on the field for to improve the terrain it is necessary the most constant maintenance as ploughing the weeds airing the soil and harrow it back down if it is soft or to drain the terrain if it is drenched while one makes dams and channels if it is dry.

And so too the right season of each such activity for it depends on the temperature and winds in accordance with day and night, the monthly seasons of the moon and the yearly seasons to know what must be protected against, which would erode the land and destroy the plants, and what should be used for its advantage, that ferment and bring minerals, for upon disobeying the Pleiades and planting on the rainy equinox it results on seeds rotting on the ground while planting after the cold solstice makes them hardly germinate.

²² “Quid est agrum bene colere? Bene arare. Quid secundum? Arare. Quid tertium? Stercorare.”

– De Agri Cultura Catonis, About Cultivating the Field from Cato, LXI.

Besides the biota where the presence of rodents makes it to be necessary to use traps or truss on the case of vines taking them from the ground, fences for foxes, plants or chemical repellent against plagues just as scarecrows and dogs against birds; and on the other hand one must use something to attract and furnish a safe dwelling to pollinators, natural engineers and other symbiosis for protection or nutrition – and the choice of such must be rigorously selected just as which seeds to replant, how to reap, preserve and what to do with the remainder of the plant.

Thus is it necessary mastery in geometry to count and divide the terrain at each exact proportion for too big of a granary or a too small one leads to waste just as the water tank and the quantity watered on them and where each thing must be placed; once that everything in want or excess is both a waste as harmful since in such unhealthy conditions grow animals so miniscule that the eyes cannot reach, but that entering the bodies cause difficulty morbidities²⁰.

And naturally basic geography to accompany the metry; for what is the worth of the fertile valley of a river if such floodplain will be flooded and destroy everything on the plains every raining season? And if you flee to the mountains what safety will there be if you do not take notice of the sun; which if one is building on the northern hemisphere it will rise always to his south and so the north of the mountains accumulates humidity and slides with rains instead of protecting – and which other thousands of considerations of where to put each facility of the farm one has.

Therefore we have the fascinating aerial views showing the terrains divided in perfect squares of different sizes by the due efficiency of machines used symmetrically on it; while others are colourful thin bands as if some horizontal stratification of geography or slender radial slices parting from a single water centre where are all houses – while fenced amorphous blobs always attest for their free livestock while flooded terraces reveal what type of cereal is cultivated there and so all the more immense diversity of vistas which converge to the optimal organization in accordance with the nature and conditions of the place.

For wine and oil have to be put in underground cellars while the dry grains require raised dry places; protected against all rain and humidity just as from the wind, heat and cold having thus windows for ventilation on their due position to the winds of each season and walls plastered with stucco from powdered marble or such other defences against adverse conditions to the preservation – besides measures against rats, weevils and every plague from the very amurca from the olives and repellents which make the environment uncomfortable to their proliferation as the raising of predators that eliminate such.

²⁰ “Sin cogare secundum flumen aedificare, curandum ne adversum eam ponas; hieme enim fiet vehementer frigida et aestate non salubris. Advertendum etiam, siqua erunt loca palustria, et propter easdem causas, et quod crescunt animalia quaedam minuta, quae non possunt oculi consequi, et per aera intus in corpus per os ac nares perveniunt atque efficiunt difficilis morbos.”

– *Rerum Rusticarum de Agri Cultura*, About the Things of Cultivating the Field, I: XII, the legendary line; in how he so exactly described microorganisms causing diseases over a millennium and a half before Leeuwenhoek and much before germ-theory.

Just as the work utensils have to be kept each on their due place; both the vocals and semivocals ones as the mute ones for it is a monumental endeavour to organize where they should be, where they feed, where they work, where they rest, where there is the repair and where it is best to put each structure for the most efficient usage of such closer to the manure or the means of transport or the house or the water besides the endless difficulties for which inexperienced farmer would expect mere grain silos to be such deadly traps always killing people by burying them with the granular landslide as sand, suffocated upon casually entering too deep on its particulate air before such can settle or be aerated and even directly exploding its well oxygenated inflammable aerial starch? The very shape, division and placement of each requires extensive architectural mastery to be properly done; avoiding both loses as tragedies.

And what is worth a perfect production of tomatoes or roses if they will rot without being used? For so the figs suffer in flavour while dates rot and nuts dry; and before I end up entering on the different cycles of photosynthesis to different climates and conditions together with an immense body of facts of biochemistry it suffices to say that it is impossible to grow every kind of plant in a plot – besides merely the space to produce all the plants, and animals and products, present in the world there is impossibility even of a single one if it is not fit for even those that germinate without dying can be extremely unproductive and bad.

Therefore it is only in absolute voluntary ignorance closing their eyes that makes someone say that they should produce everything locally independent of the world instead of the efficiency of Argentinian pears packed on the other side of the Ring of Fire; although it is not perfect it is infinitely more efficient than their impossible ideas of self-sufficiency in every existing product – and even such would be more expensive, and of worse quality, than the global cooperation.

For if in one farm wants apples and pears so that it divides such into two equal plots while it is fit only for one of its products it can, generously, produce seventy boxes of apples and thirty of pears; while an equal farm of slightly different soil wants the same, but produces thirty apples and seventy pears – where obviously recognizing each other and organizing for instead of the total product of two hundred boxes each one produces only that which is most advantageous for it begetting two hundred and eighty total product is the best option besides the better quality of such propitious places and advances on their art in such specialized function.

Thus it is necessary to organize trade with his neighbours so that each has more than what they would have alone; and to ascertain the conditions of the roads if they exist, if they are well kept and if they are safe against nature and banditry to the market of the closest city – and so is necessary the infrastructure to keep such mute carts, barrels and all else besides the unarticulated motors that carry such and work the fields just as the articulated hands that guide such so that the

legendary advantage of rivers is more in providing such valuable logistic of a cheap way by water than any fertility of its sediment.²⁴

I scratch at the surface of the preoccupations and occupations of those who truly practice the rustic art of culturing the field, but with of course it is impossible to in the middle of an argument teach the listener about the knowledge and progress of the arts through millennia of human development – to which division between the profound science and its product to that of guesswork and old mindless doctrines should be clear.

And then in looking at examples in history we have endless in Rome; a place mostly ruled by the mindless population and their demagogues plebeian tribunes, and so that to ‘decrease inequality’ they instituted a law that any individual could only have at maximum five hundred iugera of land²⁵ – the reason for that exact number or anything else of the particulars of the law are completely arbitrarily, and many alike laws took on other random numbers, decided by the foolish whim of the people for no purpose or aim, except their own imaginary gratification of a ‘more equal distribution of wealth’.

But what advantage could there possibly be for the State to have unorganized and worthless fields cared by the ignorant population rather than in the hands of those who had the proper knowledge to make them productive?

The entire State, and thus the population, lose greatly by that awful use of their land and failed production; how dreadful of a choice when they lived one bad harvest away from famine since if it rained too little the plantation would not grow in draught and if it rained too much the houses and farms are taken away by the flood, if there was too much wind the young plants would break and if too little the stale air was harmful, if there was too much sun they would waste away if too little they would not grow at all, if the all too common internal sedition took hold or external war came

²⁴ “ἐπεσέρχεται δὲ διὰ μέγεθος τῆς πόλεως ἐκ πάσης γῆς τὰ πάντα, καὶ ζυμβαίνει ἡμῖν μηδὲν οἰκειότερα τῇ ἀπολαύσει τὰ αὐτοῦ ἀγαθὰ γιγνόμενα καρποῦσθαι ἢ καὶ τὰ τῶν ἄλλων ἀνθρώπων.”

– Ιστορία του Πελοποννησιακού Πολέμου, History of the Peloponnesian War, II: 38, where how even greater is the access to the sea to a State; as it says that Athens thus by the wealth of commerce enjoys the best fruits and goods from the entire world, as impossible otherwise without trade.

“εἰ δὲ δεῖ καὶ σμικροτέρων μνησθῆναι, διὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς θαλάττης πρῶτον μὲν τρόπους εὐωχιῶν ἐξηρὼν ἐπιμισγόμενοι ἄλλῃ ἄλλοις: <ὥστε> ὁ τι ἐν Σικελίᾳ ἢ δὴ ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ ἢ ἐν Κύπρῳ ἢ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ ἢ ἐν Λυδίᾳ ἢ ἐν τῷ Πόντῳ ἢ ἐν Πελοποννήσῳ ἢ ἄλλοθι πού, ταῦτα πάντα εἰς ἐν ἡθροῖσται διὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς θαλάττης.”

– Αθηναίων πολιτεία, The State of Athens, II: 7, where thus this author sets how both cultures and luxury from Sicily, Italy, Cyprus, Egypt, Lydia, Pontus, the Peloponnese or any other place flow into Athens; benefits of sharing knowledge and technologies which then dwarfs even those benefits of some more pleasant spices and items or of that momentary increase in the total production.

²⁵ One of the worthless Licinian laws.

plundering the market and roads which are as the arteries of the social organism transporting both goods and people as information would be cut off leaving them with no commerce for food or fertilizer just as tools and medicine and if one plague upon the plants struck or a pestilence upon people and cattle²⁶ – their little flex of popular power so carelessly yielded out of spite simply to mock the patricians²⁷ is worth all pains they suffered locked on the Capitol as the Gauls ravaged the City and as horrible of a measure as their reckless plebeian champion on Cannae and the ten thousand other disasters when they followed their impatient instinct goaded by the worthless tribunes who yelling sweet empty words guided then to over-shout the knowledge and science of the senate²⁸.

²⁶ “Defuncta civitate plurimorum morbis, perpaucis fumeribus, pestilentem annum inopia frugum, neglecto cultu agrorum, ut plerumque fit, exceperit, M. Papirio Atratinus C. Nautio Rutulo consulibus. Iam fames quam pestilentia tristior erat, ni, dimissis circa omnes populos legatis qui Etruscum mare quique Tiberim accolunt ad frumentum mercandum, annonae foret subuentum.”

– Ab Urbe Condita, From the Founding of the City, IV: 52, where after the pestilence came the usual famine since they were forced by disease to neglect the culture of the land; and the famine that comes after is then worse than the pestilence itself was, but not worse than the internal agitators of order.

²⁷ “Vtrum enim defenditis an impugnatis plebem? Vtrum militantium aduersarii estis an causam agitis? Nisi forte hoc dicitis: “quidquid patres faciunt displicet, siue illud pro plebe siue contra plebem est,””

– Ab Urbe Condita, From the Founding of the City, V: 3, where they fail in showing how that proposal is beneficial to the state; something merely to oppose their opponents, where as far as possible form all political science we have this dull repetition found throughout our entire history of the worthless intrigues between two coalesced factions that waste all gains at the cost of the general good in their struggle for power to the ideologies simply made mindlessly as contrary mirror to each other where if one is right the other then is left.

“Videte, quot res, quam inutiles sequantur illam viam consilii, iactura operum tanto labore factorum, uastatio imminens finium nostrorum, Etruscum bellum pro Veiente concitatum. Haec sunt, tribuni, consilia uestra, non hercule dissimilia ac si quis aegro qui curari se fortiter passus extemplo conualescere possit, cibi gratia praesentis aut potius longinquum et forsitan insanabilem morbum efficiat.”

– Ab Urbe Condita, From the Founding of the City, V: 5, and of course the disastrous consequences of empty flaming words have by appealing to the excited feelings of the population rather than any sound plan of action; which I recommend reading the entire discourse in this scene where after the so convincing inflammatory words of the tribune he goes on in detail of how wrong he truly is and the awful result the proposed course of action, meant simply to oppose everything the senate proposed, would lead to.

²⁸ “Sub hanc uocem ex omnibus partibus contionis clamor oritur nullam earum uiuere debere nec quemquam superesse tyrannorum stirpis. ea natura multitudinis est: aut seruit humiliter aut superbe dominatur; libertatem, quae media est, nec truiere modice nec habere sciunt; et non ferme desunt irarum indulgentes ministri, qui audios atque intemperantes suppliciorum animos ad sanguinem et caedes irritant.”

– Ab Urbe Condita, From the Founding of the City, XXIV: 25, where the people enraged decide to kill all the daughters of Hiero in the very temple just to right after regret their brutal cruelty; ‘the nature of the multitude is to be either base slaves or haughty masters; the mean of liberty (between the two extremes) they cannot let go (without debasing themselves) nor do they know how to possess it (without falling into tyrannical licentiousness), just as there is no lack of those who will indulge them to every evil’.

In their tyrannical rage in having to see others in a better station in life with more wealth than them they decided to decrease the quality of life of all; which is the ‘right decision’ if our goal is to ‘end inequality’ – but if our goal is to make life better, to give the State more power to accomplish greater goals, we rather have to increase ‘inequality’ and give the management of the land to those who will produce the best results from it.

Society, that is progress and comfort, is sustained on the shoulders of giants.

There is some awesome burn between two of the Hundred Schools of Thought of ancient Chinese philosophy, which I cannot remember the quote or location right now²⁹, where a prominent leader of one of the schools is portrayed saying how ‘real man produce their own food’, a sentiment said in all words by Varro in how he cannot believe how effeminate and weak society degenerated too when they buy meat and grains in a market rather than producing on their own farms, and how thus we must be self-sufficient instead of relying on others; and then without commerce there would be no poor and rich, and no vices of greed or gluttony or theft or corruption and so on – to which the opposition asks if he made his clothes or was it his sandals or something like that, and started to point out how everything needed proper skills and art so that without commerce and government nothing would work.

How much more ridiculous such still existing anarchist dream of ‘making everything yourself’ and that such is the ‘true equality’; when a life time would be far from sufficient to reinvent every tool, mine dozens of metal, refine them, build microscopes and other instruments, reinvent or merely learn knowledge of electronics to build every chip and component himself in order to create a computing machine where he would have to write the operation system and every program himself – to then have an empty internet that he made himself.

And which, of course, we so easily by today by each doing some part of the giant process; a thing impossible to produce even with the actual knowledge and blueprint given, how much more hopeless to in that condition of equality produce that scientific progress and improve the quality of life – forever doomed to the most savage life vulnerable to the elements, animals and disease,

“Frui namque pace optimo consilio cum populo Romano seruata per intestina arma non licuit; quorum causa atque initium traditur ex certamine factionum ortum, quae fuerunt eruntque pluribus populis exitio quam bella externa, quam fames morbiue quaeque alia in deum iras velut ultima publicorum malorum vertunt.”
 – Ab Urbe Condita, From the Founding of the City, IV: 9, where it says directly how the party struggles are more ruinous to the State than external wars, famine and pestilence or whatever else is ascribed to the wrath of the gods as the evils which a State can suffer.

²⁹ By the sheer villainous devilishness and disrespect I would bet on the second master of Dao, that rabbit Chinese Diogenes, but I do not feel like combing through his loathsome works to find it again; yet it is the Dao who has as a principal doctrine that view, and the craftiness of Ke is not above that making up of tales to directly criticize others.

as has most of humankind died before reach their second decade alive and which precarious condition only so recently improved.

But we will properly mention Specialization, which allows more efficient production and thus things impossible alone, on the next chapter.

In the poorest countries we find the greatest equality; where we can have ten equal men seated around a bonfire fighting for a dead squirrel as their only food – where none is left satisfied.

And on our unequal country we have a billionaire CEO who sits with his millionaire managers; all eat and drink until pleasure turns to pain – where in the immense inequality of thousands of times all leave happy and satisfied.

And whence comes such misery and suffering omnipresent on the barbarous nations out of our sphere of civilization? From the soil, sky and their bodies? Is it because of our soil being good and theirs worthless; from our climate blessing us with the abundance from the heavenly coffers and cursing them with scarcity and disaster – from us having a fine pedigree in our holy pure blood and they having that of inferior sub-human races? Far from such fallacies; the only difference is the state of development in our arts of the scientific!³⁰

We have the description of the city of Concepción as it was destroyed by an earthquake³¹.

Most of the inhabitants escaped safely from the houses which were overthrown forward forming small hillocks on the middle of the streets; and although we have the description in how on the breakfast they felt the first movement so that they began to run and see a side of their houses thundering down while they left so that unable to keep on standing they crawled on their hands and knees barely enough for the street to see the other side falling when the beams flied beside their foreheads and the cloud of dust both blinding their eyes as chocked their mouths – although we have such description the worse is what comes next! When they dare not approach the ruins just as no one knows if their dearest friends and relations are not buried dying for the lack of help; while the thatched roofs catch fire and spread flames everywhere – where they can only what knowing to be ruined for few have even food for the day. Can a more miserable and fearful scene be imagined?

³⁰ “Rursus (si placet) reputet quipiam, quantum intersit inter hominum vitam in excultissima quapiam Europae provincia, et in regione aliqua Novae Indiae maxime fera et barbara: ea tantum differre existimabit, ut merito hominem homini Deum esse, non solum propter auxilium et beneficium, sed etiam per status comparationem, recte dici possit. Atque hoc non solum, non coelum, non corpora, sed artes praestant.”
– Novum Organum Unus CXXIX.

³¹ In *Voyages of the Adventure and Beagle III*: XVI, but which event I mostly paraphrase here.

But any in the world knows that such are not the act of the gods, where the acephalous believers on their ignorant despair they only worsen everything scarifying children in vain, and that from such tectonics movements comes also the phenomenon of a great-wave; which just so struck and washed away almost everything of the little that they could still recover – leaving pools of salty water on the streets where their children making boats with the wrecks of tablets and chairs looked as happy as their parents were miserable.

And so was seen the true description of misery by the explorers; and such was nothing more than the past condition in which all humans lived³² – not any product of ‘capitalism’, as the most ignorant fools like to blame today, or the ‘rich’ and the ‘system’ like the oldest human literature already ridiculed such revolutionary Greek communists and Chinese separatists hermits.

‘Work’ was not some marked hours in the day; it was all they did in life upon waking up until sleeping – the ‘entertainment’ was to sit on the ground talking to others, still working in some clothes or utensil, or to dance on the hard ground exposed to the elements while eating mushrooms. And even upon working so much there was never warranty of even eating; travelling one or two days seeking for an animal to hunt is a common description and the explorers, like every modern person, thought it incomprehensible how they could so easily spend days not eating and such effort to acquire food for perhaps one week – and of how, just like with the earthquake, any tempest would destroy their mud and straw houses taking also anything they had accumulated while the drought would force them to abandon everything for some to try to survive by ending up finding some better place after go on lost. And this still is the reality of many tribes; alone on their savage world, untouched by all ‘exploration’ and modern inequality.

A bad earthquake at once destroys the oldest associations; the world, the very emblem of everything that is solid, moved under our feet as a crust over a fluid – a second of time which conveys to the mind the strange idea of insecurity which hours of reflection would never create.

And so earthquakes are enough to destroy the prosperity of any country; if what happened at Concepción less than two hundred years ago had been the inert forces exerting such power which

³² “Among the savage nations of hunters and fishers, every individual who is able to work, is more or less employed in useful labor, and endeavors to provide, as well as he can, the necessities and conveniences of life, for himself, or such of his family or tribe as are either too old, or too young, or too infirm to go a-hunting and fishing. Such nations, however, are so miserably poor, that from mere want, they are frequently reduced, or at least think themselves reduced, to the necessity sometimes of directly destroying and sometimes of abandoning their infants, their old people, and those afflicted with lingering diseases, to perish with hunger, or to be devoured by wild beasts. Among civilized and thriving nations, on the contrary, though a great number of people do not labor at all, many of whom consume the produce of ten times, frequently of a hundred times more labor than the greater part of those who work; yet the produce of the whole labor of the society is so great, that all are often abundantly supplied, and a workman, even of the lowest and poorest order, if he is frugal and industrious, may enjoy a greater share of the necessities and conveniences of life than it is possible for any savage to acquire.”

– The Wealth of Nations, beautifully exemplifies Adam.

in former geologic ages they exerted in Europe how completely the great England would change! What would happen with the lofty houses, cities so densely populated, great manufacturies and every beautiful public or private building? Such happening in the dead of night, how terrific would be the carnage? Instantly England would have gone bankrupt; all papers, records, documents and accounts would at such moment be lost – the government being unable to collect taxes, failing in keeping its authority, the hand of violence and rapine acting uncontrollably, hunger on every large city without any pause and the inevitable following of that by pestilence and death.

Such could very well have happened, but just as the tempest and draught that would destroy savages there already little would affect England just so too today such earthquake would find resistant infrastructure, well safe digital records and quick internal help in few hours – although meteors and global tectonic actions, as have already happened so many times in our natural history, would still decimate as the most primitive savages on their straw huts.

In this Age of Information there is an epidemic of ignorance in knowing how there have never been so much abundance, safety and comfort as today; in how the common station of humankind was to struggle to one utmost without any guarantee of getting even what to eat or come back whole or alive from the daily hunt for food – just as only the voluntary denial of our rational capacities can stop one from seeing that the unequal system that prioritizes certain things above others is what begets such rarest of times where, after millennia of stagnation, we expect the future to be better than the present.

There is the exploration of the natural environment worsening such future prospect and certainly there could be even less suffering, however how alien to such scientific discussion is that imaginary concept of ‘equality’ – and so perfectly contrary to the abolition of riches is the path to solve it!

The common citizen, just as the accursed companies, naturally do not worry himself with such dangers or even laughs at what sounds as fantasy for perhaps, he prays, it will never happen during his lifetime, but it is the entire duty of the government to ensure the future preparing for such disasters which will inevitably come; neglecting such for the sake of the immediate pleasure of the common man or the uncared of the deregulated exploration of companies is the great failure of every current government – and those who think the problem is the current social condition are part of the problem.

We have seen then, in the most basic morality, how ‘inequality’ is really the most fair of things; as there cannot be equality between unequal things – and it is the very different situation of misery that is the opponent to defeat if rather than empty ‘equality’ our goal is to improve the general quality of life.

And such misery is then achieved by the misdirected resources of humankind; it is the state of nature which all animals daily suffer and one which by progress we have conquered so as to be now a shocking absurd to society any resemblance to our former station of life – and the unscientific mismanagement, seeking imaginary aims such as ‘equality’, plunges us back nearer to that nightmare.

To conclude this tasteless topic we have then that even if we force all to have a job chosen by the government as ‘useful’ and receive the same pay, if we make that hellish society simply for the sake of equality itself, it would still fail.

Or would all people be forced to also spend it on the same exact thing?

We lie crispy wings and so we use the money to buy a chicken.

But is our artistic friend forced to use his money to buy chicken and eat it right there?

What if he chooses to buy and store the pieces to eat little by little each day; is it unfair to us that we will see him eating it when we no longer have that which we ate all at once?

And what if he chooses to deprive himself of eating to instead season it with his special sauce and sell it for more with the material and work he put into it; or is all commerce forbidden?

Is he also forbidden to get live chickens and breed them producing more?

If he does so is it unfair for him to have many chicks now and for us to be cockless?

‘Equality’ would have to be called on every instant of time to return people back to the past until they all occupied the same space in time doing the same actions.

Or what if he buys or acquire in any way wires with which he can invent circuits and computing machines; can he only sell it for the price he bought the wires for and the work of the day so that he can never change his wealth and be better off than any other?

Then we would promptly lose all technology as so much easier would be to perform simple jobs.

If he can sell for any price he wants, is he forbidden to hire people unless he pays that exactly same, since any less would be ‘stealing’ from their gain? Are people forbidden to work for him, even when it pays better than other jobs, unless he shows that he is passing them a hundred per cent of the gains to the worker? This is the same as his artwork; such better job would be demanded by virtually all, and to choose the most fit he would have to go down in his offer until converging on the lowest, most efficient, he can.

All cases are hurtful not only to our friend who is hindered from becoming a trillionaire with his invention of the computer, but all those workers who would be so much better off working for him; and to us as the government how awful of a choice to lose such powerful machines – a system which would make the entire work of the population several times faster and safer, multiplying the production and power of all workers by the monumental contribution of a single one.

And equality, for the infelicity of all, will hinder that and all other human progress; one million coins are insignificant to its one millions owners – and if they all lose that coin to instead a single person possess it how greatly could that one invested into that great improvement for all the State.

The constant action of misery, be it the ripping of the heart of seeing your son in filthy dregs begging for the bread which you cannot give or to suffer the frugality of not buying the newest phone, acts upon most of humankind when there is inequality, but it acts upon all if all are equal; and how bitter and humiliating of a thing it is to see the works which cost men so much time and labour through history to be overthrown in minutes by those who by force take the authority of the government and undone all its progress – which strongest language fails to communicate a just idea of the desolation suffered by men when exposed to the most savage state of homogeneous ignorance.

But in reality that despotic equality would never hold; as even if our artistic friend was thus entirely forced to work with fixed gains and forbidden of all trade he would still dispose of his mind and his body on his free time – even with all the loss to society of his employment being in any menial task they chose his labour would still be his own.

For would someone with a larger family receive more for the same day of work, or would he have to work more hours in the day? On the same way the one with a small family might use his time to go beyond being satisfied with his minimum necessities working more exchanging his hours for commodities and future comfort; be it tiding his house, fixing his roof, cutting his grass, putting on a fence or any other work – those who take such choices in place of sloth, as remarked by Ksenophon at the opening, will always have more than the others.

Ergo the cruel and meaningless domain of equality, thankfully, will never hold.

Even if the government abolish all forms of money and possession, so that they receive just their food and are lent their items in exchange for their work, on his interactions with other people there will be the irregulable exchange of favours in how nice or pleasant or skilled he is so that equality will be merely nominal since he will develop exchange and debt in his social informal contracts; in how he treat his friends and the friends of his friends or do things for them soon will create that inevitable abysm between those who are alone and antisocial being perfectly poor and destitute in authority while others are popular and famous thus rich in that power to influence

others and receive favours – the ‘geometric equality’ inevitable in all ambits of life beyond what that fanciful empty dream of equality can stop.

There is thus no place for changes to be made in this direction; all will only worsen and degrade the conditions of life rather than improving – and to see that flaw, just as to find what then must be done to move towards that improvement, we use not of ‘opinion’, but merely admit the reality of cause and effect before us.

III – The Dystopia Of Social Communities

Dealing with ‘equality’ above I gave a bunch of random examples where the meaning of the word breaks down and it is unclear what should be done, as is indeed every case as it is some ambiguous and meaningless concept, and then the actual consequences of either way; that is, I repeated the same argument many times in how actual science of the effects in reality, rather than some lofty vague dream, are far from any desirable course – and now we merely repeat those same analysis, but instead of ‘equality’ we treat of any random imaginary aim raised by some disturbed mind.

That is socialist reforms and we will once again just go at a bunch of random situation to show how the most distinct of them are still all in the same basket; all discordant of the reality of cause and effects – and obviously no matter how artfully seductive some sweet words may be or how good his intentions in his ingenuous dreams are, if it does not further our goals and produce the due results then the verdict for its adoption is clear.

Let us start by treating of our so popular modern plague of ‘Communism’, even though it has absolutely nothing of original or unique to it; but stepping past that mindlessness of ‘equality’ we arrive at this quintessential example of some government guided to purely imaginary aims through the pure guesswork of norms made-up from ‘morals’.

Many, perhaps most, think that ‘Communism’ is that ‘absolute equality’; both from the opposite party how preaches so as an immoral insult as from the supposed supporter of it thinking it an utopia – and indeed there are endless things nowadays called ‘Communism’ as it was simply embraced by so many in name with not a care to really follow what was originally put under that name.

Here we will ignore those random shades of the same disease and focus on the work of Heinrich; which is, like all other social communities, some ‘geometric equality’ where the author imagined up some criteria for that ‘merit’ in order to, supposedly, construct his dream world.

The ghost has its famous manifest dictated in quasi-poetry; the entire document is a short, shallow and crass joke trying to scoff with irony by conjuring disconcerting images, however due to the incapacity of the writer the only one ridiculed with such is the edgelord showing off as an author in his satirical humour of pseudo-intellectual high-falutin³³.

³³ “Ein Gespenst geht um in Europa – das Gespenst des Kommunismus.”

– Manifest der Kommunistischen Partei, The Manifesto of the Communist Party, where so it starts saying that ‘a ghost looms over Europe, the ghost of Communism’; this entire part will deal with critics presented on the Manifesto and Das Kapitel, and then the Politeia, but as there is no point in quoting those entire works here on notes I will encourage the reader to check those works out to confirm the exactness of my remarks.

Now ignoring the deplorable attempts at literary art we have an equally lamentable attempt at arguments; we are started off with ‘they produced too much, created too much civilization, destroyed the old means of production, made barbarians become civilized, too much commerce, generated too much wealth, and made people under one law and one government and one nation’ which can only be seen as a praise, but somehow it is supposed to be a critic at the economic system that begot that – how that is the case, however, is left for the reader to guess at, although we can fairly easily infer how the author himself would be utterly unable to explain the sense of his words if he were asked and also that in that setting such meaningless words would resonate strongly with the changing culture who wanted to live in some immutable idealized past that never really existed.

This inference of mine above is more enlightening than the entirety of the work itself, but let us see further; as little after we see a critic of the equality between men and women – he feels indignant that now they can do the same job and get ‘more equal’, although still so far from equal, and so as the work became less heavy he says that ‘men have been devalued’ since women now can perform the work just as efficiently.

Again; what possible justification could there be for that? How is making the work easier and producing more wealth be a negative point? Certainly appalling to most nowadays, but as said above we can easily understand by seeing how it has nothing to do with actual Economy or the good of the Commonwealth in question; he merely has that twisted moral ideas disconnected from reality which he wishes to impose upon all – on this case the very common one about the ‘traditional family’ and a patriarchal society where his sex and age world determinate his status rather than any concrete or useful trait. So that the financial freedom of women as individuals threatens his imaginary status and for her to not stay at home serving her owner is to him unacceptable.³⁴

³⁴ “Si in sua quisque nostrum matre familiae, Quirites, ius et maiestatem uiri retinere instituisset, minus cum uniuersis feminis negotii haberemus: nunc domi uicta libertas nostra impotentia muliebri hic quoque in foro obteritur et calcatur, et quia singulas sustinere non potuimus uniuersas horremus. equidem fabulam et fictam rem ducebam esse uiuorum omne genus in aliqua insula coniuratione muliebri ab stirpe sublatum esse; ab nullo genere non summum periculum est si coetus et concilia et secretas consultationes esse sinas. atque ego uix statuere apud animum meum possum utrum peior ipsa res an peiore exemplo agatur; quorum alterum ad nos consules reliquosque magistratus, alterum ad uos, Quirites, magis pertinet.

...

Quamquam ne domi quidem uos, si sui iuris finibus matronas contineret pudor, quae leges hic rogarentur abrogarenturque curare decuit.” maiores nostri nullam, ne priuatam quidem rem agere feminas sine tutore auctore uoluerunt, in manu esse parentium, fratrum, uiuorum: nos, si diis placet, iam etiam rem publicam capessere eas patimur et foro prope et contionibus et comitiis immisceri.”

– *Ab Urbe Condita*, From the Founding of the City, XXXIV: 2, where the old Cato starts such a hilarious discourse about how women, two millennia and two centuries from now, ‘are no longer modest like they were in the time of ours fathers’ and goes on about how degenerate his age has become in immorality and disrespect in they walking around without permission and trying to change people’s mind on the vote as if they were individuals with the same rights as men; and so Plato and the most ancient writings we have show the

But although that is perfectly clear it is still technically pure speculation, as on the text itself there is just a constant repetition that 'capitalism brings the destruction of the family' with no argument or elaboration to support any of the affirmation made therein; with no advantage what so ever in reality it is simply how he morally feels, and that resounding so strongly with all other 'conservatives' led to this endless popularity.

The entire body of the text consists of such ludicrous assertions and it is up to the reader to make any sense of those untied words and give reason to the loose phrases that are at best barely connected together; there is no structure of a presentation, elaboration and conclusion as any argument would require - instead it makes no difference the order of the phrases, if said at the beginning or afterwards or at the end, for they are random moral remarks adrift.

That should more than suffice on the topic, but due to its fame which so greatly exceed reality we will have to go on deeper into it; even if it is nothing about economy or the improvement of the conditions of life, being entirely normative on his fantasy of how the world should behave, it still goes on criticizing the economy.

It says that each farmer, weaver, artisan and so on has been substituted by the 'proletarian' who simply works on a machine; 'losing all the identity of the many professions' and allowing some to 'get rich doing nothing' while others 'have economic instability worse than slaves who at least have their food secured'.

Very weird and discordant points where it complains both that 'anyone can be king' and of a 'slavery' that can choose whom to serve; there were indeed awful conditions as the population exploded with the industrial revolution, but it uses that simply to incite the rage of those too ignorant to know how their idealized past was always one bad weather away from a famine - and the often mentioned critic to that where 'he failed to predict the middle class' in how they conveniently ignored the reality of the past just as the future result of all that production so greatly giving them more than those before ever had.

The other point is about structure unemployment; where people can remain in their field producing all they eat and use if they so want, but where is the critic aimed at then? That others should be forced to buy that produce at the 'price of hardwork' rather than form its actual quality and quantity? Which 'question' we have dealt above; and which idealized hard work of the past so greatly differs from the conform and progress of humankind - both in the exertions to produce as in having actual medicine and food for the people of the world to enjoy a life far from the miseries of unrewarded hard work and scarcity.

same of so many political parties today with such nostalgia for some idealized past 'a few decades ago' that has never existed, and which claimed 'morals from back then' are meaningless guesswork with no relation to the actual good of the State and quality of life.

It is a terrible gangrenous past and our entire discussion about this work is in how to convince people of such obvious reality when they refuse to actually study history and the past; what advantage to the world is there to stop the progress of medicine to keep the jobs of mystical healers and stop the invention of cars and tractors in order to keep farmers and peddlers in their business? None are ever mentioned or discussed; they simply want to keep their 'comfort' of not changing – for the loss and harm of all immediate and future humankind.

Sculptors of spears and shieldsmiths cursing the end of the war because peace ruins their professions; it being to them unthinkable to learn to put handles in helmets in order to make pitchers – the unacceptable fate of being forced to change their former job to adapt to the necessity of what is useful to the people making no longer plate mails but buckets and instruments of agriculture instead of tools for war³⁵.

Should we keep sending our sons to war so they can kill each other forever in order to keep those war-smith in their unchangeable job?

And that is a less frightening thought than what the work proposes in stranding us forever at the mercy of nature and the whim of the weather; both in our very security in food and health as to our undeveloping and never-improving quality of life in pleasures and comfort – that is what the 'critic at structural unemployment' amounts to.

It can hardly be any worse when thus analysed even in the shallowest considerations, but no one doubts of how effective that 'critic' resounded, and resounds, in the feelings of the popular mind.

He goes on saying that only now will the industrial revolution of the nineteenth century it is possible to create that perfect world of his fantastic utopia; stealing all progress and improvement made by others and as some steampunk Amish community saying it is enough and the best for all future humankind to stagnate there – as the actual implementation of it by the Soviets indeed progressed extremely fast by copying the 'west' in technology, and then as there was nothing more to steal for now it came to a halt crashing down into collapse from its unsustainable ideas.

It goes on saying how catastrophic previsions is the weapon of the rich in scaring the masses in order to stop them 'from taking power and saving themselves from oppression'; that political and economic science are such weapons and the analysis of the dreadful reality that comes from awful choices is a fiction – and instead without any thought or intellect they should just go for those morals that they know in their hearts to be 'the right choice', 'or otherwise...' he goes on then doing his best to scare the masses with catastrophic previsions of a future where all are enslaved as mere parts in a machine only being fed enough to keep the machine working, the individual alive, until they unite and take the means of production.

³⁵ The beautiful ridicule of Aristophanes, in Εἰρήνη or 'Peace', although in his economic ignorance his point is another one completely.

What is a funny catastrophic prediction since one of the very slogan they used is ‘from each according to his capacity, to each according to his necessity’³⁶; in their critic to the rich saying that he will not pay any more than to fulfil their necessity and having them work as much as he possibly can – the unusual incoherence present in every thing said, as rather than any science coming from any set of axioms it is a bundle of normative statement that he felt sounded good.

Which is where that critic of ‘his failure to predict the middle class’ come in, but that critic is rather meaningless; his ‘prediction’ was a random assertion from his imagination and not based on any science – it was never worth anything to consider that wild fancy that had absolutely no base in reality to begin with.

That violent rise was also a key factors of Communism and the main distinction to other socialist movements; as that which rule on most countries today where they are elected and progressively change things – what Communism said ‘the rich’ would never allow to happen so that they had to break out in revolt to take the power. Socialist parties have had as their main enemy those very other socialist parties, since they compete for that same ignorant resource of the masses, and from that mutual calumnation the other parties that are not Communist became ‘the false prophet’, ‘disguised bourgeoisie’ and ‘the right disguised to keep them in slavery’; so that other extreme socialist parties who achieved success in acquiring control over the state without a violent insurrection, as the Marcia su Roma and the ascension from the Reichskanzler to Führer, were branded as the opposition and ‘the right’ – ‘the left’ being originally those who advocated for social change and ‘the right’ those who wished to maintain things working as they mostly were, those terms lost their meaning and usefulness completely by that twist about one merely being the mirror image opposed to all the other did even when both are radical revolutionaries.

We saw the conservatism so effective on the call to arms of the Communist campaign; and true to its ideal the Soviets mass killed any non-hetero with a family and others ethnicity just as they abused nationalism on the ‘Great Patriotic War’ – only as other radical socialists, as that aforementioned Fascism and Nazism, used those same tools that they somehow made that ‘the mark of the right’ while doing the same themselves and when those equally abhorred Capitalism, but just abhorred each other more as they all competed on the same ‘far-left’.

Thus rather than ‘criticizing the left’ this applies to both common polarization of modern politics; as they are both purely moralists with no hints of any science or argument beyond that social changed about how others ‘should’ behave for some imaginary meaningless purpose.

But enough of that simple history and the infinite discordant forms it took, let us go back to the ‘original’ idea of the Communist party.

³⁶ “Jeder nach seinen Fähigkeiten, jedem nach seinen Bedürfnissen.”
– Kritik des Gothaer Programms.

The central theme is 'extinguishing classes', if something can be called 'central theme' when it is a collection of loosely connected moral standards; on this point, too, it is completely ambiguous what is a 'class' since the governors live in luxury as the ever-ruling aristocracy more than any bourgeoisies of 'capitalism' – the work is thus not a consideration or explanation on how to do any of that, as its assertions are empty appeals devoid of content or logic, and just as it fails to show how is there any benefit in doing any of that.

On the purely economic analysis it is a 'command economy'; they dictate what should be produced and force thus all to work paying the same in accordance to the number of people on the family that the father chief of the family is supporting without being able to expend on anything nor give anything to anyone since inheritance is forbidden – that simple path violating all personal freedom, for the sake then of nothing more than everyone obeying his moral fantasies that there should not exist the 'rich'.

It is not about economy nor it is about the good of the people; ignoring that hellish future with no progress or improvement there is the consideration that Communism extends to all aspects of life – all art and intellectual freedom too is controlled by the state.

Any fun and ideas that diverge from that sacred moral code he imagined up leads to the immediate execution of that individual; be it any religion, philosophy of sexual orientation or just being a bachelor who does not want to raise a family yet – how much worse for any woman who would dare to defy her masters and want to have a profession or to not bear children as commanded!

Without any reason, economic or otherwise, it forces upon people to obey some conduct and all else is wrong to their moral sense; we saw the realization of that nightmare in the bolshevik revolution – and besides that stagnancy in progress and in all improvement of quality of life they go further in expending the resources they do get from their primitive work not for the good of the people, but with no practical use or benefit it is expending in watching and persecuting its own citizen to make sure they all live in everything in accordance to the moral of the government.

It does not exactly advocate for that 'absolute equality'; it slyly evades it while so strongly leading to such misinterpretation for the sake of popularity – but everyone receives a different pay and condition of life based exactly on those moral ideas, not from the side effect of the nepotism of those in the government and receiving power and reward simply for their loyalty to those ideals but by design it is the 'geometrical equality' of a gradual ladder of skilled labour receiving more 'for their work'.

This was it for the short Manifesto; it was used in many countries and it diverges in its conditions and demands throughout them – as inconsistent on its dispersions as it is in its internal ideas and as are the many parties today who call themselves 'communist'.

But let us go now to the actual philosophy of the man who built that modern craze, not because they are pleasant, but like anatomists and physicians we talk about unclean things because there is profit to be gotten therefrom in how they err³⁷.

If we want to raise the veil and try to understand how Heinrich himself interprets *The Capital* we will only find the confirmation that he is petrified looking at the head of Medusa; *le mort saisit le vif* with his heirs distorting his words so much, but no less fanciful is the ‘original’ who while attacking those who pull down the dog-leather helmet of Hades upon their own eyes *de ea fabula* narrator – he describes an entirely pink-coloured world and out of thirty and eight attacks he makes there is not one thirty-ninth fragment of arguments so that to our infelicity not even the furies nor the Persian robes nor the black cassocks treated of that intellectual terrorism as a threat higher than a *culpa levis* allowing him to thus run amuck in his wild revelries³⁸.

He then follows with the absolute pretension of saying that he follows his own path independently of what the masses says; truly the *falutin* of the populist fool who dreams himself standing forming a shadow by cutting the light of the sun as if Gerion were ever to allow him to escape the company of *Pesistratos*, *Theagenes* and *Dionisus* in his *bolgia*³⁹ – or is not cajoling the masses by proclaiming one’s hate at the rich the shortest path to tyranny?

³⁷ “An anatomist or physician may speak or write his judgement of unclean things; because it is not to please, but profit.”
– *Leviathan* I: XIII.

³⁸ This horrible paragraph, and the few following ones, is my mockery to his pretension. He makes that meaningless mentioned of the Medusa, he uses the phrase ‘*le mort saisit le vif*’ which is about the inheritance of property and thus he says it is the endless slavery of the ‘proletarian class’ being maintained and I use it to those who did inherit his foolish ideas of Communism, he uses the helmet of Hades which makes the user invisibility to say that the economists are dumb and use their it wrong instead pulling it over the eyes and blinding themselves and I can only say that if the helmet is invisible they will see through it anyway so that I say that his attack at the stupidity of others is he talking of him ‘*ea fabula* narrator’ as he randomly uses later too, he goes on then that mention of a simplistic pink-coloured world and that the argument of others are worthless and I just fuse them into a single one against himself, he does a random mention of the furies for no reason and of ‘black cassocks’ which I fuse into something with sense that neither the mythical furies nor the ‘Persian robes’ which are purple which represent the kings of nations nor the ‘black cassocks’ which are the priest class did anything to stop that great evil of spreading. In sum; I take his many meaningless attempts at using cool phrases and references and give an actual context and sense that they can be used in – attacking him with them, which he attempts to do against the world in vain with no argument to back up his wild claims of how exactly the economic science he critics is flawed.

³⁹ “*Vien dietro a me, e lascia dir le genti:*”
– *Purgatorio* V: 13, although he found ‘*Segui il tuo corso, e lasciadi le genti.*’ in his manuscript and out of nowhere he quotes it after saying he is no populist demagogue like others, but really with no context, explanation or source of his random quote.

Thinking himself a poet he lets out those empty references of graphical effect and rather than a cultured polyglot it sounds like a middle school brat who finding random pretty words use them out of context and sense; the ancients use their mythical tales for their lessons quickly going over some point without needing to repeat an entire analogy to exemplify it and not, like him, absolutely randomly evoking some character just for the sake of it for not purpose to the argument – while if happens to be for the ‘content’ of the story it is merely the word ‘coin’ or any such small detail of no importance to the original, but to him it is a golden opportunity to try to show of his extremely limited capacity of interpretation that leads to his deficient applications of references.

That, however, only happens directly at the opening so that he forgets entirely about it throughout the entire remainder of the treaty; so finishing his moment of pleasuring himself he shows to be somehow even worse in his skills of Economy.

His single argument is how the work determinates the value of things; that a certain amount of grains are an identical possession to a certain amount of iron or of gold and such is determined by it being the same difficulty of managing to produce such amount of each to the standard of global labour – and thus if a craftsman after hours of work would sell something for a value now with a machine doing it on half the time or work the value of such item will fall to half.

Supposedly for that purpose he also goes on in nauseating hundreds of pages listing ‘all ways that money has been ever used’, but which aleatory mentions with no structure or sense contributing in nothing to any understanding of economy or to his own argument.

He sums that in his grant equation that takes all his mastery in mathematics to show that ‘absolute law of economy’ that ‘he found out’; that ‘ $x=y$ ’.

The scene is Dante with his living body, after crossing Inferno, causes a shadow as the rays of the Sun in Purgatorio hits him; causing an impression and tumult with the ethereal inhabitants there – to which Virgilius says the line above that he should just move on following him without paying attention to what the others say.

To which, if he were alive, I reply bringing him back to reality that he would never be in such position of the scene since Gerion, the guardian of the eightieth circle of Inferno, would never allow him to leave his bolgia, the ditches that compose the eightieth circle and where are punished all fraudulent and all kinds of flatterers who seduce with lie and deceit.

“Πάντες δὲ τοῦτο ἔδρων ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου πιστευθέντες, ἡ δὲ πίστις ἦν ἡ ἀπέχθεια ἡ πρὸς τοὺς πλουσίους, οἷον Ἀθήνησι τε Πεισίστρατος στασιάσας πρὸς τοὺς πεδιακοὺς, καὶ Θεαγένης ἐν Μεγάροις τῶν εὐπόρων τὰ κτήνη ἀποσφάζας, λαβὼν παρὰ τὸν ποταμὸν ἐπινέμοντας, καὶ Διονύσιος κατηγορῶν Δαφναίου καὶ τῶν πλουσίων ἡξιώθη τῆς τυραννίδος, διὰ τὴν ἔχθραν πιστευθεὶς ὡς δημοτικὸς ὢν.”

– Πολιτικά, Politics, V, where so Aristotle mentions three tyrants who reached their throne by posing as heroes of the people against the antagonized rich, exemplifying such extremely common populist technique.

Then he kindly explains to ignorant mortals that it means that some 'x', as a certain amount of flax, is equivalent to some 'y', as a certain amount of coats; then he summons even Aristotle as if his argument had any resemblance to what was being said by Aristotle when he used some alike comparison.

His proof then is no induction or exhaustion of cases; he supposes that such twenty flax equal one sweater - and then two sweater are worth forty flax and five sweater are worth a hundred flax.

And that is it; 'if such is true, then it is true' - the only 'conclusion' is the very initial assumption!

Then he explains why that rule is like that; evoking a third occult factor that is nowhere in the equation he says that 'what makes them equal each other in different quantities is the labour used to acquire each'.

Now, the elementary school child that can do that equation should also be able to tell that his assumption has no relation to the real world; somehow it can be even more flawed than it is ignorantly simplistically - for what happens if the other party already have flax or does not feel like exchanging his coat?

Unbelievably he even asks 'and what if the village does not need flax?', however ignoring it he thinks it is a fitting answer to introduce machines and more productive workers as 'the cause of that devaluing' of the flax on the village; what is obvious superfluous and insignificant before the want and demand of the village for that product - the sale of flax does not scale in exchange as he proposes, but instead if everyone is cold with few coats they would ask more flax for each while if all had superabundance of coats or were in the middle of a sweltering summer with nothing to do with their coats they would accept less flax even if in both cases it was the same 'amount of work' to weave each sweater.

On the same way with grain, iron and gold which 'have the same value because they are just as troublesome to get'; their exchange value is one thing in the market, but is a bakery indifferent about which one they receive from their purchase? And what about a building facility which only needs the iron? On the same way if one is to do exchange with the exterior the captains of ships want only the gold because a trip with it equals to dozens with the others that require more quantity and therefore more space to transport the same value; and thus he pays more for the gold than one would pay at the city square - because each has its usage and independently of the labour to produce it instead it is the necessity of the consumers which determinates its price so that the proportion of what each one is worth is individual to each consumer and not an absolute proportion from the ambiguous 'amount of labour' that took someone to get it.

As any child as seen that a cup of water is worth a fortune of gold to one lost in the desert; and yet ten thousand cups is not worth ten thousand times more since the thirsty person has no use for that which he cannot drink nor carry with him - and the value of those are not changed if the

seller had to climb over the Everest before getting there on foot or if he just found it on a puddle a few feet away before selling.

On the same way with his sewing machines where ‘with half of the work the price falls to half’; with a cheaper price there is a greater quantity demanded and not having enough products they would pay more than such minimum possible for a sale – with such gain existing it is advantageous for others to enter the market so that the production increases, competing, and takes the price to some value lower than the past, but entirely dependent on the rate of demand to the ever less efficient cost of production rather than to his acephalous ‘the price of sale is the cost of production’.

And so if everyone is a farmer of maize they will all have more than what they can consume and no reason to exchange with anyone; if a single farmer planted grapes instead every other farmer will want to exchange his useless maize for it and rather than ‘based on his work’ he will receive many times the amount of maize in exchange for his unique grapes than if he had planted maize himself – the will of the buyers wanting something will naturally define how much they pay for it.

If another grape-grower move into the market then the price will decrease; not by becoming any easier and less troublesome to grow grapes, by the presence of more in the market – and if all decide to then become grape-seller to get rich like the first grape seller then their value will be as nothing, while a single maize-grower left will be in the position of the original grape-grower where all want his produce and will pay just in proportion to that want.

As Ksenophon says, an increase of smiths makes the price of wrought works fall; and when corn and wine are abundant those products become cheap – although in a mercantile spirit as mad as his claim that the silver in mines can be mined endlessly forever he claims that the increase in that profession makes the price go even higher⁸⁰.

The powers of observation of Ksenophon are inferior only to that of Robert; and without noticing he saw the reason why too much grains lose all value, but silver does not as a nation grows

⁸⁰ “ἔτι δὲ οἱ μὲν ἀγροὺς κεκτημένοι πάντες ἔχουσιν ἂν εἰπεῖν ὅπόσα ζεύγη ἀρκεῖ εἰς τὸ χωρίον καὶ ὅπόσοι ἐργάται· ἦν δ’ ἐπὶ πλεόντων ἱκανῶν ἐμβάλλῃ τις, ζημίαν λογίζονται· ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἀργυρείοις ἔργοις πάντες δὴ φασιν ἐνδεῖσθαι ἐργατῶν. καὶ γὰρ οὐδ’ ὥσπερ ὅταν πολλοὶ χαλκοτύποι γένωνται, ἀξίων γενομένων τῶν χαλκευτικῶν ἔργων, καταλύονται οἱ χαλκοτύποι, καὶ οἱ σιδηρεῖς γε ὡσαύτως· καὶ ὅταν γε πολὺς σίτος καὶ οἶνος γένηται, ἀξίων ὄντων τῶν καρπῶν, ἀλυσιτελεῖς αἱ γεωργίαι γίνονται, ὥστε πολλοὶ ἀφόμενοι τοῦ τὴν γῆν ἐργάζεσθαι ἐπ’ ἐμπορίας καὶ καπηλείας καὶ τοκισμοὺς τρέπονται· ἀργυρίτις δὲ ὅσῳ ἂν πλείων φαίνεται καὶ ἀργύριον πλεόν γίγνηται, τοσοῦτον πλείονες ἐπὶ τὸ ἔργον τοῦτο ἔρχονται. καὶ γὰρ δὴ ἔπιπλα μὲν, ἐπειδὴν ἱκανὰ τις κτήσεται τῇ οἰκίᾳ, οὐ μάλα ἐτι προσωνοῦνται· ἀργύριον δὲ οὐδεὶς πω οὕτω πολὺ ἐκτήσατο ὥστε μηκέτι προσδεῖσθαι· ἄλλ’ ἦν τισι γένηται παμπληθές, τὸ περιττεῖον κατορύττοντες οὐδὲν ἥττον ἡδοναί· ἢ χρώμενοι αὐτῷ.”

– Πόροι ἢ περὶ προσόδων, Ways of Revenue, IV.

wealthier – because silver can be stored for indefinite time as he says, and that hints to the obvious unsaid fact that grains that could not be eaten will just spoil away.

Thus as the necessities for food are met they lose all value; and those more lasting things grow in value as men no longer are worried with the mere immediate nourishment – the whims of demand, which can be made dearer by a lack of supply, is what explains those phenomena, and how worthless then is the wild baseless assertion that ‘it is the work to get it that defines the value’ which also far from being original is well repeated throughout time the paralogism that ‘if finding a kilogram of gold were the same trouble as producing an ear of grain then they would be the same value’.

He mentions how valuable are Brazilian diamonds and that if chemists found a way to easily press carbon into diamonds then the so high price of diamonds would fall below the price of common clay blocks; which is easy to see that indeed that would be expected to happen, but it is a boundless amount of foolishness to argue that it would happen because of easier means of acquisition instead of the superabundance it caused – for we could have the scenario of diamond workers going mad and mining to the centre of the earth seeking all diamonds in existence or making the hardest mission yet in all of human history to bring a load of rain from our neighbouring ice giant.

Would such most extreme difficulty then make diamonds the most expensive things in existence?

Much to the contrary; such abundance would find no market – and without demand the price would on the same way fall below that of blocks, even though they were so impossibly hard to acquire!

With the tools of today it is easier than ever to extract metals so that we do so on the most massive scale; even so most of the metals were worth nothing when they were so hard to get because they were undesirable, like the lanthanides, but today when it is so much easier to find and separate them they are as expensive as gold – and although gigantic machineries evolve each day making it easier they only increase in price!

Once again because everything is the ‘demand’; the desire of the consumer of wanting that dictates entirely the price of everything – ‘how much he suffered to manage to produce that’, or the ‘labour’, is absolutely irrelevant and has no relation to the value of things.

Just so the gold is not from its difficulty of acquiring and its size that makes it good as a coin; a piece of paper of negligible difficulty, besides that made for protection, or even some digital bits made in fractions of seconds on the database is much better in fulfilling its purpose of facilitating the exchange and marking the value of everything – to which imaginary difficulties invented by himself in his insane theory he goes on with the most ridiculous excuses and exceptions to explain how ‘that piece of paper’ can have that value so distinct from ‘the difficult to produce it’.

On the same way that a good general is of the greatest value during a war or when one is eminent, but little such is worth during times of peace⁴¹; or some genial software engineer who could write some incomparable algorithm that would allow the analysis of data as never before advancing all human science or a biochemist who knows the cure for cancer – being trapped on a farm on the countryside their salary, and production, will be like that of any other man.

It is not the man, the product or the seller who determinates the value; but the buyers – the owner gives his good the greatest value he can, but the value of such is no more than what others estimate it to be.

‘If something has no value then the labour spent on it also has no value; thus such labour is not labour’ is something that he says trying to reconcile such obvious insanity and discrepancy of his argument that ‘labour defines value’ to reality; absurdity at the ridiculous making up arbitrary and forced exceptions to keep up his fanciful view – once that his lines that ‘goods have no value to their owners but to those who do not own it; and so the useful-labour gives value in accordance to what is useful to the buyer’ is perfectly useless and nothing more than the ‘demand’ already explicitly known for a century without any justification for his doctrine that ‘the labour gives value’.

It goes down an nauseating word-play making up new Frankenstein words, as the Germans love to do, which I will spare the reader, but his point is that morality and éternelle justice which to him the mere word ‘labour’ is as some sacred god apart from all logic of reality cannot ever be treated as a commodity; it has to be distinct of all mundane factors of economy and he invents new meanings whole distant from the original of what is ‘labour’ in order to not admit that his entire premise is failed – when labour, which means simply and nothing more than ‘work’, is identical to every good being offered as a service by the same mutual offer and demand that defines the value of every commodity and object.

We buy the services of others when we need it just as any other good; when there are many painters or builders the price of their labour goes down, and if there is a single one it goes up as people compete to who will get that good.

Thus from both breasts of our Mother in common, the earth and sea, we receive freely from the gods or buy with our labour the abundance of matter limited solely by nature; through which

⁴¹ The value or worth of a man is, as of all other things, his price; that is to say, so much as would be given for the use of his power, and therefore is not absolute, but a thing dependent on the need and judgement of another. An able conductor of soldiers is of great price in time of war present or imminent, but in peace not so. A learned and uncorrupt judge is much worth in time of peace, but not so much in war. And as in other things, so in men, not the seller, but the buyer determines the price. For let a man, as most men do, rate themselves at the highest value they can, yet their true value is no more than it is esteemed by others.”

– Leviathan I: X.

industry of men we obtain the animals, vegetables and minerals be such easily exposed on the surface of the earth or hidden below – such are ‘commodities’ and after we nourish our necessities we do not waste the rest but exchange with others for that which we do not have⁴².

Yet even if there was some endless territory for the continuous acquisition of all natural resources there is not only the necessity for raw produce; and in both cases we do not pay for that which nature offers for free, but for the service of obtaining and furnishing to us that thing and by the manufacture upon them – just as we offer our speciality of labour by the same demand in accordance with the necessity of those who desire such commodity produced by our labour.

To model such in our modern Economy we use the exact same tools of equations and graphs; ‘labour’ is a good and commodity, or rather we can say that we do not pay for the ‘good’ and ‘commodity’ but for that labour to bring those things to us – in either case the distinction of them, and then the deification of ‘labour’ as some magical value-defining thing, is completely imaginary.

⁴² “As for the plenty of matter, it is a thing limited by nature to those commodities which, from the two breasts of our common mother, land and sea, God usually either freely giveth or for labour selleth to mankind.

For the matter of this nutriment consisting in animals, vegetables, and minerals, God hath freely laid them before us, in or near to the face of the earth, so as there needeth no more but the labour and industry of receiving them. Insomuch as plenty dependeth, next to God's favour, merely on the labour and industry of men.

This matter, commonly called commodities, is partly native and partly foreign: native, that which is to be had within the territory of the Commonwealth; foreign, that which is imported from without. And because there is no territory under the dominion of one Commonwealth, except it be of very vast extent, that produceth all things needful for the maintenance and motion of the whole body; and few that produce not something more than necessary; the superfluous commodities to be had within become no more superfluous, but supply these wants at home, by importation of that which may be had abroad, either by exchange, or by just war, or by labour: for a man's labour also is a commodity exchangeable for benefit, as well as any other thing: and there have been Commonwealths that, having no more territory than hath served them for habitation, have nevertheless not only maintained, but also increased their power, partly by the labour of trading from one place to another, and partly by selling the manufactures, whereof the materials were brought in from other places.”

– Leviathan II: XXIV, which together with the I: X above are the only resemblance of economy in the Leviathan, which sadly the remainder is, like Communism, pure moralism of ‘how the world should be’ besed solely on the ‘absolute undeniable truth’ that is his empty religion with the morals of ‘how god intended it to be’.

Taken by some mental illness Heinrich just read through those perfectly developed concepts of Economy and ignored to understand them; and as his economic model is perfectly illogical and meaningless he properly focus on yelling that those who 'do not work' have to die instead of 'being in command' – as the owners of farms and machinery who 'hold the capital enslaving the worker for his own gain instead of working himself'.

Which, of course, needs no commercial model or any logic in order to touch the heartstring of the masses who will not even read the damned book, but just follow the slogans that please their ears; the giant book itself so awfully written that it feels more like it was made to force the reader to give up and consent with his conclusions that so much seem to be convenient to the 'workers'.

Where, as aforementioned, the 'absolute equality' that most believe when they join the cult is not what he really advocates for; nor is there any meaning on his slogan of 'abolition of the classes' – he merely ignores the name of 'classes' as he divides his society in a long hierarchy of classes ranked by his own definition of merit.

He goes on a longer example of: 'Let us imagine ourselves in a community of free individuals doing their work in means of productions in common and every labour is combined as a single one as the labour of the community; instead of individual and of private use the product now belongs to the entire community – a portion serves for the consume of all as means of subsistence and a distribution of the remainder becomes necessary. The way of distribution then is a historic moment and can be, for example, in accordance with the hours he worked; thus the hours of hour is linked both to what he produced to the good of community as from on the other hand it is also the measure that he receives for the individual consume. On this case it is simply transparent the effect of his work on the production and distribution.'

Now that 'simplest possible example' is already so deficient that it is even painful to consider; as it supposes some 'equal necessity' to all and that 'hours of work' are identical to the amount actually produced as if all were equally demotivated, crippled and unskilled.

What about several people wanting some thing that is only enough for one, what criteria decides who gets it? It creates more problems while simultaneously solving nothing; and all normal people should promptly propose the most common thing that every barbarian has been able to realize – that each man produce what he wants, eat from it whatever he wants and then exchanges with others when he want some of their production.

But he himself ignore any further building up of his scenario or any science and merely says then 'what if then instead of the time spent we substituted that by the skill level of the work?'; where he jumps away from that unsustainable hypothetical scene by going back to commenting on modern affairs in how he will make universities for free to train new professions and those will receive more than the unskilled work based on how skilled that profession in – and that is his 'merit' of

what each is 'worthy' to receive, working for him and receiving what he sees fit for the price he sees fit with no freedom to do his own exchanges and evaluation with each other.

His point is that then what one 'gains' can only be spent with consuming; the best doctors or scientists in the world can be 'rich' and be paid many times more than the unskilled rabble, but he want them to spend everything everyday with ten thousand prostitutes or what not instead of building a laboratory or have the freedom to invest on anything - it is forbidden to accumulate or to build capital, all gains are only to be consumed entirely and immediately!

Such is the fate of the classes he sees as 'worthy' of being rich having a more pleasant life in his 'real meritocracy'; differently from the owner of a farm or company who 'just explores the worker getting rich without working' - as he feels morally indignant at that free exchange that resulted in that he says that the government has to be the owner of everything determining all prices and what everyone gets, forcing thus his fantasy that 'labour is value' by making it come true as everyone works for him and he defines from his imagination what is that 'labour' that deserves pay.

So he wants people to receiving money solely from direct manual work and not any intellectual contribution, it matters nothing if it improved the world ten thousand fold, or some great benefit one built because only sweaty physical labour counts as 'real work'; and money only to consume on his own pleasure because the house is a property of the government and one cannot invest on the chickens there or open a business or try anything or even leave to his children the fruits of his work - one has to work endlessly and spend it all.

Thus on such ideal form it would already be a horrible hell to live in, but besides all this pain inflicted on its own population by both the economy and authoritarianism wholly moralist arbitrarily forcing his ideals of what is good there is still the forces of nature; as inevitable such worthless system collapses there are massive humanitarian tragedies waiting in the future of that State, and those ideals of supposed 'moral' betray themselves as the control over 'merit' and supreme power to the loyalist class that agrees with him means merely that it all will be filled by the incompetent flatterers who please the powerful boss - who together would happily squander all the luxury as tyrants over the people until that inescapable collapse bring respite to the poor population.

That is all clear and simple; and there is nothing else to his philosophical fantasies that really have nothing to do with scientific economy, but still he goes on looking for other points to excite feelings that can win over the masses.

The entire point is to avoid people to exchange amid themselves; everything is mediated by the state buying and selling everything - he defends it under the threat that otherwise 'the usurant misers' buy something for a hundred to sell for a hundred and ten since they are buying it not because they want the item but already with the cunning evil intention to resell it dearer.

And that is just like exchanging his one-hundred coins for one-hundred and ten of someone else's; and that is the same as directly stealing from the other person.

I do not need to say how much more important than any menial physical task is the administration and entrepreneurship of the owners of companies; and how merchants are the entire logistic of transporting goods whither they are more expensive that is where there is a greater necessity of them – for the defence of them it suffices to read any actual economist or to make the due course on their complex art.

We do not need to go about 'disproving' every point by an accumulation of facts and arguments of why it is false; we instead merely need to show that 'there is no reason for it to be true' – that it does not correspond or is based on the reality of this world⁴³.

Looking at the real world we have that farmers can waste their entire day going from house to house or around the city trying to sell his grains; and any buyer can go out travelling around through every farm and craftsmen looking for each item – and of course that would cost to them absurdly more time and labour than the commission of the merchant who buys everything that one wants to sell and sells all one wants to buy, and of course it is often directly impossible to go sell or buy your product when the commerce is in a faraway city or on the other side of the world.

Even going on such venders is a large cost of time so that nowadays we ask ourselves had we managed to live before the delivery when we spent a night or an afternoon to go eat or buy something!

To go to China to buy a hat or some cylindrical magnets with balls would cost many thousands monetary units; that if we find such travel services, knowing Chinese to communicate there and the time of doing that – but thanks to the thieving merchants who do such service in mass we buy them for fifty monetary units!

A seller would spend at least dozens of thousands to take a small load of his product there; losing hundreds or thousands of time what he made with his eventual sales – but thanks to the merchant he finds a market even when everyone around do not want it and has his profit on what would be an absolute loss of his perishables!

He says that someone who buys leather and produces boots aggregates value with his work and so one who cooks and every one, but such much more valuable service of mediator of trade 'does nothing for him to ask more than he paid for the product'; as if by not changing the outward appearance then 'no work was done', as by delivery men and any other possible service.

⁴³ Read On the Origin of Subatomic Species to learn about what makes a valid assertion.

When, as every political economist knows, those merchants are rather an absolutely necessary part of the complicated machinery that distributes the provisions and other commodities of a large nation.⁴⁴

His criterion of evaluation? Pure religious cultism; literally so, and we are going to get metaphysical soon!

However I will leave that for the conclusion of this part.

He says that the workers receives ‘only his salary instead of part of the production’; what shows his incomprehension of the nature of money as the token of how much of the production he has a right to – with which he can very well use it to buy the same item that he produced and try to sell his production like that.

Where then most of the workers, as bricklayers and teachers or prostitutes, perform services consumed without any possible product for them to receive back; and even so there usually is to those who perform services in a company a commission in accordance to his work.

And further the State having all the stores and distribution points he will still need sellers, and caretakers of inventory, administrators, truckers and all such related cost; which will have to be paid from the general social product – they receive pay to ‘do nothing’ and receiving only such power of exchange, money, and not ‘part of his production’ which is an intangible service so that it is whole without any coherence what he says himself on one part of the text and on another.

It will actually just take the risk of such investors, but it will have to on the same way hire someone simply to administrate if everything is in order and for him to be the one who evaluates who to hire to actually work manually there; and with no risk to such hirer he will with impunity just dictate whatever nepotism he wants since being impossible to go bankrupt who pays for all the loses of inefficiency and waste is the entire population.

Heinrich loses his sight of all these trivial events of reality and all he cares about is to uphold his sacred views on morals where the only goal on all this mess is to avoid that ‘the rich become ever richer and so on getting ever more ad infinitum’; what can only happens if there is such niche and necessity unfulfilled on society and for him to provide a service superior to the rest that brings trust and convenience to who sells in mass to him and who buys on him – therefore he improves the market and establishes the model of progression while the foolish government who supresses

⁴⁴ “If I could succeed in accounting for the present high price of the necessities of life, without criminating a class of men who, I believe, have been accused unjustly, and who, every political economist must know, are absolutely necessary in the complicated machinery that distributes the provisions and other commodities of a large nation.”

– An Investigation of the Cause of the Present High Price of Provisions, about such common and utterly baseless blaming of merchants.

him remains on its worthless inefficient wasteful form worsening the entire quality of life of all of society only to not give the satisfaction of someone becoming rich by showing himself superior to his 'ideal' system.

Free competition makes him salty and they have to just accept his unquestionable imagination as the perfect mode without any competition allowed; where if a government were to truly provide such service and were truly better then no merchant would have any chance of competing by using of a worse system – his being better to society, which means to be more efficient in utilizing the resources and labour of the people, what chance will there be for the one just steals to himself the gains instead of investing in improving? Losing to such is the clearest proof that his company-government is no more than a social defect and deficit rather than the saving paradise of society which he hallucinatedly baselessly claims it to be and forbids all to compete against him.

He knows he has no chance of competing against his betters and as Keresani forbids the priests of walking around the realm and to give him advice by trying to crush them all before their can threaten his worthless tyranny; where on the same way the Golden Haoma would crush him with his mace dethroning him – for upon competing with the rest of the world he would feel as if his potency had atrophied from his muscles and the quickness had fled from his feet and as if a dark veil had been thrown over his mind when the reality is that he was never strong or fast or provided with intellect!⁴⁵

He jumps around like he is a drugged hare to and fro from one side to the other and is unable to form any concrete view of the whole market; as upon jumping to 'other ways that the capitalists steal the labour' he talks about how they buy the means of production and hire the labour – when if the weavers were the owners of the machines they would gain more, and therefore such extra is stolen by the capitalist.

However while it suffices to say that it is the exact same case already treated I will illustrate it step by step how empty his words are since he merely says that and elaborates no further how exactly he proposes to 'solve' it; first where will the worker buy the machine? Because if the estate owns it he will receive what the estate decides to pay him; and on the same way 'he is robbed because if he owned everything he would get more for that work'.

Would he buy it on the same place as the capitalist then?

But such also is a capitalist who bought the materials and hired the handiwork to make them!

Would he need to seek each personal machine craftsman?

⁴⁵ Yasna IX: 24, 29.

But on the same way he would be paying for the labour of that craftsman to increase his own; just as the smith from whom he bought pieces and paid for the service without sharing of the gains of the machine or the miner who sold his service of seeking for ore and did not receive from the production of the smith, craftsman and weavers that use his labour but only receives that fixed by his initial service independent of what it became – the sixty and two or ninety and two craftsman who work to prepare the wires used in clocks receive purely the value of their services by the time spent independently of the consumer will do with that product they made, be throwing it away or making millions, nor would there be a way to go out ‘giving commissions’ of everything they do with his ‘product’.

On the same way every machine craftsman would spend most part of his time seeking who wants to buy such machine instead of working; and who buys risks the work of some unknown person – while a machine is too much for a single worker and a waste without several to operate it and when a mechanic revolutionize the machine with more efficient ones he alone will have no impact in improving the world without hiring in mass for them to produce all such better machines instead of everyone wasting their labour making the worse ones.

It all derails extremely fast and, as above on the little mention of the ‘equality of anarchism’, society itself would be unable to hold under those imaginary aims and norms; how much less for them to treaty of actually beneficial measures as in how what improves lives is not any guesswork of norms but that of investors who compete to the most efficient method of utilizing those resources and labour of society.

And he goes down to the most insignificant arguments of the lowest quality in his desperate defence of his sickening vision against reality; as the meaningless ‘argument’ randomly thrown with no context or point to make that ‘nature does not makes men with money and commodity and others only with labour; then it is not the natural order’ – just as it also does not creates houses nor clothes or anything, for even a fruit it is us who pluck it out and take it for it is not ‘natural’ for the ‘nature’ to bring it to our mouth so that we can chew it how much less the unnatural act of cooking and preparing things, and all we have in life is the ‘unnatural’ result of our actions improving or worsening our situation and that of others with what we leave.

But obviously ‘nature’ is entirely ambiguous and used as the author well pleases to his convenience evoking some arbitrary inherent divine righteousness to what so ever he says; and it is not the most natural thing the desire of men for women? And from such directly offspring is produced and the continuity of the species; at the same time is not the father the king of his family and he passes down the law to his wife and children as a natural consequence? And such follow their nature producing the grandchildren and great grandchildren of such following the same law; forming a village and a kingdom – on the natural desire to survive and provide for their families they seek better ways of finding food and instead of nomads who seek for stones to make a spear

and hunt now they seek first a house and a wife and an ox to plow⁴⁶, is such change of life to be criticized? Should they try the impossibility of living the exact same life of their ancestors? Such is what is obviously artificial and against such natural sequence of events that led to the new way of life and to kingdoms; and to infernal metallic mills belching smoke upon the sky and monetary units – as natural as every tree and wild beast only following their instinct on and on to this point.

Both arguments are not even wrong, but merely make no sense at all⁴⁷, because ‘nature’ is a word without any definition or meaning; it is used as a master tool to attribute some mystical and divine weight to an argument that is unable to sustain itself on due evidence and logic – it is the apex of foolishness and stupidity those who fall to such lowest appeal begging others to accept his insane cultism.

But ignoring any definition or justification of what he says he used the basic lowest-quality expression only to the general effect without any thought or value behind it; and even then the man loves incoherence so much that little after he says that ‘work is against nature’ and every man of his own choice regulates and controls nature as he wills to his benefit.

To which slip of admission is it not accepted that there is the large spectrum between the foolishiest farmer and agricultural engineers on their comprehension of how to best alter nature to a state fitting for production?

To which, again, is just an absolute loss to the State and society to defend the ‘freedom’ of such worse farmers to ‘stay relevant’ by depriving the freedom of all efficient ones to contribute more and prosper, enlarging their fields and making the value of labour worth more; until he himself is outdone and overtaken by one even more efficient.

⁴⁶ “θεμιστεύει δὲ ἕκαστος παίδων ἢ δ’ ἀλόχων.”
– Ὀδύσσεια, *Odyssey*, IX: 114.

“οἶκον μὲν πρότιστα γυναῖκά τε βοῦν τ’ ἀροτῆρα.”
– Ἔργα και ημέραι, *Works And Days*, 405.

Both are used by Aristotle, daringly treating the cyclops as the most primitive example of society and that even so they delegate laws, justifying the origin of laws and the State as naturals on the opening of *Politics*, , and my point is the ambiguity of ‘nature’ which is used for the absolute convenience of all authors to justify with divine sanctity, with no argument, what so ever they imagine to be ‘right and good’.

⁴⁷ For there can be no certainty of the last conclusion without a certainty of all those affirmations and negations on which it was grounded and inferred.

...

I should not say he were in an error, but that his words were without meaning; that is to say, absurd.”

– *Leviathan* I: V.

The remainder of the time is all he just talking of how immoral it is to let people work as much as they want and praising the laws that prohibit people of being legally hired; because as the machines produce much more than people can they have to work much more to produce just a fraction of such and now for any reason labour is something negative to him and he takes the opposite side from before and that life is to be made easier but that the machines only intensified and worsened the life of the workers because ‘only the bourgeoisies are benefited’ and explore ever more as all craftsman go work in factories – says he arguing how cruel it is to let people have the choice of investing on their future.

Funnily all his cherry-picked data, by the mere fact of still being true, only confirm what is the goal of his life to deny; that the abundance of the good degrades its value, being all service and work just one such economic good to be exchanged, so that the overpopulation and lack of demand led to meagre wages while today a multitude of adults of all classes do not even work because a single one can maintain a large family on most of the world –and not only the necessities of life but every luxury and commodity which have long been the greatest part of the expenses as never was possible before since we have the so efficient mass production, with so little strain on individuals, that he despised and spoke against when it was convenient to him to speak against that ‘easier life that make men weaker and equal to women’.

He claims that the benefits come from the cooperation of many because somehow magically ‘the labour in group produces more than the sum of its parts’ being this then what the ‘capitalist’ steals, however the obvious is how the weaver and then machine operator still alone produce greatly by the evolution of the art or tools; such progress is not imitable on his forced cooperation of the worthless state that loves the past and wants to keep out-dated inefficient methods relevant to preserve ‘the individuality of each profession’ but by the continuous substitution of companies by that with the highest efficiency and it is the good usage of resources that makes mass production great in contrast with disorganized producers not some insane magical power of ‘more than the sums of its parts’.

When a man at first took a stone or a stick to take fruit down such were capital products; obtaining something for the sake of obtaining something else with it – improving their work efficiency and thus providing more food for their family as the most successful individuals⁸⁸, for the ‘capitalism’ of the mere economical science that he wants to deny is nothing more than that pure simple logic of reality that the less apt lasts less and is outcompeted by the more efficient.

Where he uses his unilateral data abandoning any pretext of economic solutions for moral appeals, however he shows only the exact contrary of his faith for it is the great offer of working hands that took down its value to the observed point; and promptly solved when they stopped

⁸⁸ He himself mention that example of Torrens, in *Production of Wealth*, about ‘the first capitalist’; and somehow he leaves that mention as some kind of critic against capitalism instead of the undeniable march of evolution into a better condition in life.

reproducing like rabbits so that the market would achieve equilibrium and compete now to hire them – in contrast to his prophecies of the absolute vileness that would enslave all those who refused to rise in revolt against the cruel rule of the bourgeois.

Shocked before the horrible scenery as one of the catastrophes of Malthus he choose to blame something and avert his eyes from reality to his land of fantasy; thus he did not see that the efficient usage of machines and the massive capitalistic production saved the following billions from dying of hunger – and even more to die in childhood and of horrible diseases as most of humankind died before us.

How can a book so clearly flawed be produced? And by someone who even read time after time the repetition of the undeniable simple reality of the competition leading to the selection of the one who can best employ his resources?

He dared to compare himself with the most important work ever produced by humankind, that of Robert, while denying that very same mechanism and all science!⁴⁹

The explanation is in how such deficient and baseless economy is the front pretext of such many attempts of seducing the ignorant workers to his sect; where ahead he man goes down the wells of insanity and climbs the mountain of madness exposing the cosmic horror of the monstrous cultism which inhabits his mind and guides all his steps.

He does so by making up certain distinctions of his own imagination between ‘value of usage’ and ‘value of exchange’ and ‘value’ or any other random amalgamation of words as aforementioned the Germans love to do; which division have never existed and in nothing are they useful but to confuse everything with his arbitrary definitions, but which he tries to pass as the cost of production of when it is still worth it to produce for the market – but he refuses to use the name coined by others and on the most indirect manner with a multitude of terms tries to describe with the many distinct processes what is resumed to simple demand.

He uses such to, besides of confusing any poor reader who tries to understand the long rubbishes said, engrain his mystical belief that such distinction exist and so that the capitalist who works smartly instead of hard and undeniably create all such comfort and abundance of a better life in fact has no value because they are soulless products; the capitalist only cares with the ‘value of excess’ that he can explore not the ‘true value of the soul of the applied labour’ – and because of that that they must all die and only the hard workers can exist on society for the world to be good!

The world being ‘good’ is it reflecting his fantasies; not any tangible benefit.

⁴⁹ At the start of the Manifesto; it says it will revolutionize economics as On the Origin of Species revolutionized biology.

His ‘additional labour spent increases the value’ is purely defending the waste; for contrary to value it is a loss to all what could be produced with much more ease if instead of the incompetent deciding what he imagines to be the best process an intelligent one who truly thinks on what is best were to administer such recourses.

He makes-up a ‘double value transferred to the object by the labour’ which exists only on his imagination; and then he wants to shape the world to such metaphysical madness – to not use ‘cost of production’ and admit that he has nothing to say that has not been said before he says that ‘the machine transfers its value little by little to the product’ and ‘the cotton that became trash transfers such labour as value to the product for it is necessary for the final product’ following with instance so miraculous and ridiculous like that to explain how that what is eternally preserved is only the soul of the labour imbued upon the object and not such ‘value of excess’ which is the capitalist theft.

And what about a machine in a storage house without use; where did its mystical labour went upon it wasting away? They are simple wastes of inefficiency of its usage and remediated by better organization, but on his sect he feels the necessity of explaining how the sacred labour is an indestructible contribution to society.

And that a machine of a hundred and fifty can only transfer such value after the years of usage until it stops working; it does not matter if it is twenty times more efficient than before and makes one produce a thousand per day when before he would produce fifty – all of that is an illusion and ‘excess of value’!

He goes to the most absolute incomprehensible dementia in spiritual beliefs of an imaginary bizarre world with no relation to the real world; the entire foundation of his ‘economy’ is such concept that the labour transfer its soul as metempsychosis³⁰ to the product and so it is the hours of services spent the measure of the value of everything and the only thing that matters to society – not any physical quantity produced or real goods on the life of people but only the effort of the task matters for such is the ‘value’!

The capitalist thus only reorganizes to produce more and waste less, but that only spreads the value between many products instead of a single one full of soul since he does not work there hammering soul into things!

Upon buying three sacks of cotton for twenty and five coins and lose two sacks on the process of weaving so that he makes two shirts of fifteen coins each the final value is thirty because he

³⁰ Metempsychosis is the transmigration of the soul to a new body after death; and this is the word he uses in how ‘labour’ is that transference of soul into the object and that magic power of effort is what makes it valuable, not any triviality of tangible quality of life with things that make life easier, more enjoyable and more comfort.

inserted his labour of five together with the labour that produced the cotton and the ‘lost one’ transferred its soul into the shirt, but if a capitalist hires with machines and manages to lose only half a sack making five shirts of ten coins the final is fifty coins, but whence came those twenty extra coins? It is what he steals from the people; he is charging more than the soul of labour inserted and selling for an unjust price – and if he pays ten coins for the hired work he steals over half of the hours of the worker since he gets fifteen coins from it when it was the worker who produced everything thus since he does not work all his called ‘profit’ is unpaid wages to the real worker and like that he accumulates to explore in an ever greater scale!

It is irrelevant that without being hired such worker would work even harder to get five coins and that now everyone can buy shirts for a cheaper price.

Such is the ‘great argument’, a philosophical misery so foolish that it is a philosophy that begets only misery³¹, that his hundreds of pages try to make the reader accept, at times flattering with promises of the paradise of the perfect friendly society at times intimidating with threats of a capitalist hell and insults to one’s moral calling him abuser of innocents; all ‘efficiency’ and massive production of comfort and progress to a better life are just a satanic illusion called ‘value of excess’ on things and not the real value which is only the metempsychosis of work and so they are not paid for results nor for them all being equal but by what his wistfulness judges to be ‘hours of useful work’ – such is the essence of the original communism, although on his populist public appeal he hides such bizarrerie of his mind to try the most shameless brazen seduction.

It might sound like I am joking and that certainly he could not have written all of that blatant so fanciful madness; it sounds like that even for me who have to write here about such incoherence foolishness and it is hard to even form a structure and demonstration that can maintain any sense in such discordant collection of baseless assertion as the work under discussion – and all I can say is that the reader will have to check it out for himself if he doubts any assertions I have made here about the large little book in question.

What do we get from all of this horrible ramblings? Only much confusion from a very disturbed mind; no relation to any governmental or economic plan or with reality at all, but pure baseless fantasy – which mad revelries against reason and season would only lead to a retrocess and waste of what have been built thus far rather than any progress and improvement in the conditions of life.

On his delusions he saw tongues of fire dancing like comets around him and although he did not deign himself to write such with his pen he felt his syllogism so acutely that any other demonstration he felt as obtuse; thus moved entirely by faith he felt the essence of the expected

³¹ A jab at ‘The Misery of Philosophy’ in his answer to ‘The Philosophy of Misery’; where we can see two men perfectly deficient in their facultative capacities arguing with each other about how his fantasy is superior – with no a drop of reality or science.

things and such serve as his only evidence of the unseen things – even so he shall never have on the coin of his bag the divine seal of virtue.³²

Now that we have gone through that modern disease we can rather sum it in few words; that are those ‘normative’ ones right at the beginning of this section – and naturally it is not the first normative work ever made, and rather that is the most common thing to find throughout all history, but nothing more than a repetition, shallow without any substance just as devoid of arguments, of men screaming their fetishes of how others ‘should’ behave.

The quoted Leviathan there contributed to the sciences when Political Sciences were being born, but it too on its remainder advances religious views that by pure faith he believes in rather than any consideration of the effects in reality and tangible improvement of the conditions of life.

But of course ‘it is necessary to institute laws for humankind and for them to live in accordance to the law or for them to differ in nothing from the most savage of animals in all respects’³³; so let us go back over two millennia and see the first of such communist states put forth by the greatest writer we ever had – the laws that Plato, at the dusk of his life, judged to be the best regulations for humankind.³⁴

³² “Così spirò di quello amore acceso;
indi soggiunse: «Assai bene è trascorsa
d'esta moneta già la lega e 'l peso;

ma dimmi se tu l'hai ne la tua borsa».
Ond' io: «Sì ho, sì lucida e sì tonda,
che nel suo conio nulla mi s'inforsa.”

– Paradiso XXIV: 82-87; where in his colossal stupidity Heinrich quotes it because of the mere mention of the figurative coin that carries the divine seal, but which I still deign to reply and clear the name of Dante from such filthy mention; on which I use the rest of the Canto where the fire of the holy spirit inspired him to without any reason or logic to ‘feel’ the undeniable proof that his faith was right.

“Ἔστι δὲ πίστις ἐλπίζομένων ὑπόστασις, πραγμάτων ἔλεγχος οὐ βλεπομένων.”

– προς Εβραίους, To The Hebrews, XI: 1, where there is that ridiculous assertion of believing in something without any logic or reason; the only proof being his mere unshakable belief, which is used by Dante over there and all such unjustifiable unrealities of ‘faith’.

³³ A premise Plato uses very late on his treaty, but I cannot remember exactly where or the exact phrasing right now, rather than on the opening of the Politeia; and once again rather than quoting the entire work I will leave to the reader to read it himself if he want to confirm my assertions.

³⁴ “Τὸ δὲ ἀνάλογον λέγω, ὅταν ὁμοίως ἔχῃ τὸ δευτερον πρὸς τὸ πρῶτον καὶ τὸ τέταρτον πρὸς τὸ τρίτον: ἐρεῖ γὰρ ἀντὶ τοῦ δευτέρου τὸ τέταρτον ἢ ἀντὶ τοῦ τετάρτου τὸ δευτερον. καὶ ἐνίστε προστιθέασιν ἀνθ’ οὗ λέγει πρὸς ὃ ἐστι. λέγω δὲ οἷον ὁμοίως ἔχει φιάλη πρὸς Διόνυσον καὶ ἀσπίς πρὸς Ἄρη: ἐρεῖ τοῖνον τὴν φιάλην

The famous work of the Politeia, often called ‘The Republic’, is a city-state; which is like some free village or town that is not under any greater nation and so has its own laws, and perhaps a little district of smaller villages and territory it controls.

He starts on a disparaging rant about how the old poets might be right in how they describe the grant events of gods and men in the past, but that it has to be erased and changed because it is the duty of the rulers to lie to the people for their own good⁴⁵; since it can never be glorified those tales of gods or heroes crying or partying drunk in wine – that would only influence the people to become cowards and cry-babies devoted to pleasures instead of to justice and virtue.

Thus it cannot be that Achilles cried at the death of his friend and go on in mourning like it is written he did; since it is not virtuous for any to lament for the dead like he did as if it is a bad thing – that has to be censured otherwise men will grow fearing death and when it comes the time to give their lives for the State they will be cowards shamefully surrendering for the lives instead of fighting.

ἀσπίδα Διονύσου καὶ τὴν ἀσπίδα φιάλην Ἄρεως. ἡ δὲ γῆρας πρὸς βίον, καὶ ἐσπέρα πρὸς ἡμέραν: ἐρεῖ τοίνυν τὴν ἐσπέραν γῆρας ἡμέρας ἡ ὥσπερ Ἐμπεδοκλῆς, καὶ τὸ γῆρας ἐσπέραν βίου ἢ δυσμὰς βίου.”
– Περὶ ποιητικῆς, About Poetics, 1457b 17-25, says Aristotle.

“ἐπειδὴ νομοθετεῖν μὲν μέλλομεν, ἡρῶνται δὲ ἡμῖν νομοφύλακες, ἡμεῖς δ’ ἐν δυσμαῖς τοῦ βίου, οἱ δ’ ὥς πρὸς ἡμᾶς νέοι, ἅμα μὲν, ὥς φαμεν, δεῖ νομοθετεῖν ἡμᾶς, ἅμα δὲ πειρᾶσθαι ποιεῖν καὶ τούτους αὐτοὺς νομοθέτας τε καὶ νομοφύλακας εἰς τὸ δυνατόν.”

– Νόμοι, Laws, VI 770a, so that ‘on the setting sun of our lives’ is not original of Plato, which touching part he uses due to his old age at this point so that he assumes the role of legislator and guardian to best leave a guide to humankind with his wisdom.

⁴⁵ Although later he contradicts himself and say the poets have to be lying; since it is utterly unacceptable the lust of Zeus, the all-wise perfect gods fighting like flawed men for some desire of pleasure and even more that any could ever be hurt – the gods being the measure of virtue itself they can never be bad or be at odds.

“Σκύθαι δὲ τοῦ βακχεύειν περὶ Ἑλλήσι ὀνειδίζουσι· οὐ γὰρ φασὶ οἰκὸς εἶναι θεὸν ἐξευρίσκειν τοῦτον ὅστις μαίνεσθαι ἐνάγει ἀνθρώπους.”

– Ἱστορίαι, Histories, IV: 79, where it thus says that the Scythians could not accept Bacchus as a god since it was unacceptable one that so induced men into mad debauchery; nor they accepted any foreign habits in their midst as they maintained their ancient traditions as invariable and would kill those that attempted any change or the introduction of anything new.

Plato not only bent the facts of reality to fit his views, rather than otherwise, but he also rejected the formal religion of the time; following Socrates in accreting all deities into the monotheistical invariance of his perfect virtue – so that any personality, flaw, vulnerability or anything at variance of his view of homogenous virtue was to him absolute heresy.

Those descriptions are produced because poets, painters and such other artists are just imitators; they do not know how to make shoes or clothing or people or all the other things they write or draw about and thus they provide only imitations that deprave the rational and best part of the soul – and that depravation is what nourishes men who lament, a thing which only women can do, and inappropriate things of the like that are not part of the nature, but a result from that depravation from wrong imitations of the original.

Thus all of such ‘imitative arts’ have to be expelled so that they do not deprave the form of men and make then evil and shameless with their writing or drawing or such arts that the muse will rule the people with pleasure and pain instead of with the law.

Thus laughing too much or every other pleasure being praised in excess is completely forbidden; for what must be praised is justice and courage and all that is temperate since that is virtue – otherwise the children will be influenced and will become unjust and worthless.³⁶

Like common authoritarianism no literature or music, or any form of fiction and entertaining, that differs from his opinion of what is ‘moral to the soul’ is allowed; and that does not include solely the lyrics of the song, for example, but he goes on about the several musical styles and rhythms so that all besides the solemn Doric style are forbidden for any to listen to or compose be it in public or private – just as there are instruments, like those with strings and those of blowing air, that differ from each other and thus they cannot be both good and then one must be a corrosive influence so that he bans all other instruments save for those he selected based purely on his tastes.

That is the duty of his State so that the people will not become unjust; and even on the just there is music appropriate for men and music appropriate for women so that they should not listen to those others or they will develop unnatural tendencies and characteristics that are not proper for their sex – while even with the right virtuous instruments ‘it is too difficult to know what the rhythm and harmony mean without words’ so that independently of it being a hautboe or harp the naked instrument confuses the mind in knowing if what is being played is virtuous or not, so that purely instrumental music is entirely forbidden and the allowed is only with due temperate moderation neither too little nor too much.

To those ‘I would inflict approximately the greatest of punishments’; both to those poets and artists as to all who agree in saying that someone by unfair means gained some pleasure or lives better with unjust acts or that there is something advantageous that is not just – although he

³⁶ That may sound very silly and dumb, but do not put it on the same level as Heinrich; Plato is not only the most artful writer we ever had, but he has that entire body of texts from which he properly elicits those conclusion – and with thing happens nowadays as the grand outcry of outrage a few years ago, here in Brazil for example, about ‘the gay kiss on TV’ while around the world so popular are the political parties exactly for that same insanity about things that disagree with their imaginary morals that will then ‘influence the children to be depraved’, that is the aforementioned conservatism of some idealized past that has never existed.

contradicts himself³⁷ and separates pleasure and justice by saying that also is punished who says that it is better to live pleasantly than justly while generally he talks about expelling such, but other times he is stricken by ire and talks about killing them.

That is his aim of absolute intellectual oppression, but far from any practical reality of trying to repress dissent, as common to real authoritarian States, it is based also entire on his imaginary goals; that all heroes and gods have to have only virtues since they are good and perfect so that people may know what to emulate – while all of bad is to be attributed to the enemy if it has to be included at all, but on most things it is even forbidden to even mention that such bad characteristics exist or they would corrupt the mind of the children.

And of course even the proper ones cannot take all the time of the people enjoying it; they have to read neither too little nor too much as intemperance is vile baseness.

He has long arguments about how virtue is intentional; and then on his State he goes on to say that to be virtuous they have to be ignorant of everything so that they are simply incapable of doing evil since they know it not – seeing neither contraction as neither the hellish life where all intellect is reduces below vegetal insapience³⁸.

³⁷ How those contradictions would work for a law is unclear, but although the words and phrasing contradict each other it is still rather clear what he ambiguously means with both by knowing the philosophical basis he inferred them from. On this case it is that 'justice' is the 'true pleasure' and what 'should' make people really happy; and then when he separates them it is referring to the 'false pleasures' as an illusion that people think better than the 'true pleasures' of a virtuous life – so they say the same thing, but if put written as a law it is extremely arbitrary and ambiguous just as the entire thing merely by his whims of what any of that means and what is the point of those imaginary aims.

³⁸ 'Insapience' is what I use for the ultimate endorse of it, the singular disease of the Dao, which I will treat fully on the next chapter, but it is worth a previous and mention here.

“不尚賢，使民不爭；不貴難得之貨，使民不為盜；不見可欲，使心不亂。是以聖人之治，虛其心，實其腹，弱其志，強其骨。常使民無知無欲。使夫知者不敢為也。為無為，則無不治。”
– 道德經, Dao De Jing, III.

And while I often leave simply the original with the source for the reader to seek a translation of his choice or compare several translations to grasp at the original, I will this time translate it myself as rather than any reference and mention it is crucial to the understanding of the point.

'With no enlightened, the people do not fight; with no articles of difficult acquirement, the people have no thieves; seeing nothing that awakes desires, their minds do not stray into confusion. Ergo the sage in governing empties their mind and fills their interior, weakens their will and strengthen their morals. Always the people must have no knowledge and no desire. Those who do have knowledge must be stopped from acting. All action being no action, order is not deregulated.'

While my translation fills in the gaps of the string of random words that Chinese sentences amount to, the first sentence is literally 'no virtue wise, use people no fight', an actual paraphrase is much more comprehensible to the average reader; to which gist is that with no skilled or virtuous men there is no rivalry for the people to fight over, with no valuables there are no thieves and seeing nothing that they might desire they will have no

Besides the intellectual oppression he also sets the rules for what they can do with their bodies; it 'being a coral where the voice is the intellect and virtue while the dance is the health of the body' – so that likewise they must be thoroughly instructed in physical activities with some exact number of years for each training proper for that age with no more and no less, no matter how much one likes or dislike it he cannot be intemperate in having too little or too much of it, in everything said to be necessary by the state, as playing harp and fighting pankration.

For example wine is only to those above eighteen years old, but they can only taste it in some occasions since drinking it freely is only to those above thirty; but it cannot be drunk before sacred acts or before having sex or before work or for anything that is not 'for the sake of health' – only at old age they can enjoy that gift from Dionysus as 'old men are more upright and it is needed now for them to find joy in daily life' so they are the only ones free to drink at their leisure³⁹ as long as they do not show intemperance drinking to the point of drunkenness.

His State is divided in three classes; the 'bronze' of the general population of menial workers, and of course their necessary slaves from the 'other non-Hellenic races' they conquer, the 'silver' of the warrior class composed of 'the best' of the lower class who can by their virtue climb to such more disciplined and honoured life and then the 'gold' of the wisest and most virtues dealing with matters of the government.

reason to act evilly being tempted to attain it so that the wise government deprives his people of all such things of knowledge and desire so that by all being equal in both knowing nothing and having nothing the absolute order of nature, 'the Dao', will follow its proper course without our actions interfering with the perfect will of the universe.

This is basically a different disease, and much worse, than that of common moralism and of Plato; who says that they should proactively act in some way that please the gods, what is just some eternal stagnation in suffering, rather than that absolute reduction to insapience in doing nothing to not interfere with 'nature', but on this argument both converged – which today can still be seen on the ridiculous form that 'it is her fault she was raped since she was using that short skirt inviting it' often used by that conservatism group who from their baseless imagination blame problems of the 'current degenerated state' of society.

“六三：負且乘，致寇至，貞吝。”

負且乘，亦可醜也，自我致戎，又誰咎也。”

– 易經：䷛ 解, Yi Jing: Jie, IV, which on even such more respectable classic text we have that on the same line of thought describing how 'it is shameful for someone to have his carriage filled with things and that will just tempt the thief into attacking him, who else can we blame but him for doing that?' which should trigger those very conservative with a repetition of their own logic since having no principle or axiom they just profess a random collection of arbitrary behaviours that sound sweet to their deaf minds; which in both, of course, the State most benefit by having the security for any to walk with his belongings on the street without fear just as

none should fear to walk even naked in a good government.

³⁹ Today most nations have that 'drinking age', often eighteen too or twenty one, while also marking that 'adult age' where they can vote or drive or have sexual relationships and so on; and as ridiculous as that arbitrary meaningless law of Plato are those laws we have today – with a meaningless 'age' criteria that in no way reflects any proper requirement and qualification to those things, rather it hinders qualified people for no reason and allow unqualified ones by the mere virtue of 'age'.

As for the more-virtuous class of warriors, whose ‘honours are the salary of those skilled in war’, they have to go a little further and should not eat fish or boiled thing⁶⁰; only roasted things and with no spices – since such luxuries will deprave and effeminate the strength of the body.

Neither can the warriors be distracted by having any property or possession of their own; having a house or worrying about money and gifts for women would only get in the way of their dedicating their lives for the State – the State will provide all their needs and they cannot have any other care except their job as the strength of the State.

Workmen, by necessity, need some possessions for working and living their less virtuous lives; it is an evil necessity, but that does not mean they can just use any kind of shoe or clothing – any adornment is evil turning them vain and inciting something non-virtuous as a distraction of the important things and a destruction to the good of society.

Workmen cannot be distracted by having multiples jobs either; ‘no one can do two things well’ since ‘it is only possible to have the gift in one thing’ so that shoemakers can only do that profession and no other or actors can only work in comedy or tragedy, but it is forbidden to act on the two different genres since ‘it makes no sense to divide the work in several parts instead of dedicating oneself to doing the best on that single one he is suited for’ – and of course so too writers, and all possible things, having that single style and genre so that they can perform their part on the gears of the State on the best possible way instead of trying to serve two masters⁶¹.

⁶⁰ He gives some justification for some laws; for example ‘no wine before sex’ is justified by saying that the child will be born defective because of that, while ‘no boiled food for soldiers’ is based on the difficulty of carrying or acquiring water vases during marches so that ‘eating varied things makes the body get used to them as they become flesh and blood so that later the body will reject food when he has to change his diet so that he must eat only roasted things that are easy to make anywhere’ – those would be proper reasoning and justifications, but they are completely imaginary problems also based on his guesswork to justify his goals.

⁶¹ ‘That was a rather perplexing thing the first time I read it, that people cannot do two jobs well or have other professions and skills, and I passed it as another pure imaginary madness, yet at Xsenophon we find a much more sane explanation to what then could have been some lines from Socrates or some educated consensus of the time; as he says that ‘the arts are wrought on the great cities at a greater degree of perfection’ explaining that ‘for in small cities the same person does both the frame of a couch, a door, a plough and a tablet’ and proceeds how each does many things and ‘it is impossible therefore for a man who makes many different things to make them all well’; where he concludes repeating it ‘on the great cities it is only one man to make any thing and not even a whole thing, but someone makes shoes for men and another for women. And sometimes it happens that one only sews for another to cut and as for others they only cut clothes and another only joins pieces together. Therefore he whose work is found in a small ambit must by necessity do it the best.’ – and while it touches with certain taste on the reality of specialization possible only with such development of society it is clearly a great mistake blind to the true progress of the science of the art and not of the artificers.

“大馬之捶鉤者，年八十矣，而不失豪芒。大馬曰：「子巧與？有道與？」曰：「臣有守也。臣之年二十而好捶鉤，於物無視也，非鉤無察也。是用之者，假不用者也以長得其用，而況乎無不用者乎！物孰不資焉？」”

- 莊子：知北遊, Zhuangzi: Zhi Bei You, IX, where on the Dao such single occupation is a way to become

perfect through the guidance of nature; as it says 'I only did that for years while thinking of nothing and that is why I can do it so perfectly as not thinking the Dao guides me'.

Still the single-job law is just professed and he felt no necessity to deign himself to give an explanation about the principle for creating that law or the sense in doing so; if we ignore the absolute infelicity of the people living in that caste system it might seem like something good for society since it would increase their production capacity and quality with such hyper-specialized workers – yet, even if we suppose that to be what he meant, it is still thoroughly shallow and flawed.

"The greatest improvement in the productive powers of labour, and the greater part of the skill, dexterity, and judgment with which it is anywhere directed, or applied, seem to have been the effects of the division of labour.

The effects of the division of labour, in the general business of society, will be more easily understood by considering in what manner it operates in some particular manufactures. It is commonly supposed to be carried furthest in some very trifling ones; not perhaps that it really is carried further in them than in others of more importance: but in those trifling manufactures which are destined to supply the small wants of but a small number of people, the whole number of workmen must necessarily be small; and those employed in every different branch of the work can often be collected into the same workhouse, and placed at once under the view of the spectator. In those great manufactures, on the contrary, which are destined to supply the great wants of the great body of the people, every different branch of the work employs so great a number of workmen that it is impossible to collect them all into the same workhouse. We can seldom see more, at one time, than those employed in one single branch. Though in such manufactures, therefore, the work may really be divided into a much greater number of parts than in those of a more trifling nature, the division is not near so obvious, and has accordingly been much less observed.

To take an example, therefore, from a very trifling manufacture; but one in which the division of labour has been very often taken notice of, the trade of the pin-maker; a workman not educated to this business (which the division of labour has rendered a distinct trade), nor acquainted with the use of the machinery employed in it (to the invention of which the same division of labour has probably given occasion), could scarce, perhaps, with his utmost industry, make one pin in a day, and certainly could not make twenty. But in the way in which this business is now carried on, not only the whole work is a peculiar trade, but it is divided into a number of branches, of which the greater part are likewise peculiar trades. One man draws out the wire, another straightens it, a third cuts it, a fourth points it, a fifth grinds it at the top for receiving the head; to make the head requires two or three distinct operations; to put it on is a peculiar business, to whiten the pins is another; it is even a trade by itself to put them into the paper; and the important business of making a pin is, in this manner, divided into about eighteen distinct operations, which, in some manufactories, are all performed by distinct hands, though in others the same man will sometimes perform two or three of them. I have seen a small manufactory of this kind where ten men only were employed, and where some of them consequently performed two or three distinct operations. But though they were very poor, and therefore but indifferently accommodated with the necessary machinery, they could, when they exerted themselves, make among them about twelve pounds of pins in a day. There are in a pound upwards of four thousand pins of a middling size. Those ten persons, therefore, could make among them upwards of forty-eight thousand pins in a day. Each person, therefore, making a tenth part of forty-eight thousand pins, might be considered as making four thousand eight hundred pins in a day. But if they had all wrought separately and independently, and without any of them having been educated to this peculiar business, they certainly could not each of them have made twenty, perhaps not one pin in a day; that is, certainly, not the two hundred and fortieth, perhaps not the four thousand eight hundredth part of what they are at present capable of performing, in consequence of a proper division and combination of their different operations.

What he truly means and aims with that is perhaps undiscoverable, but we can be sure that he is not talking about economy; it is like all the rest merely something he found pretty and so adopted that all people 'should' then behave in that way that pleased him – without a thought about the results or reasoning for it.

So too medicine is judged to be 'false' if it recommends people to be in bed receiving care instead of contributing to the State; for if the person stops doing bodily labour and is there diseased what reason would he have to live? So that medicine has to heal the person fast straight away otherwise it will never heal them at all so that the person should just die while he was just in his life without giving people trouble and thus undoing all the virtuous actions he did in life by having such excessive and shameless love for live.

As for pregnant women they have to walk around since their health is transmitted to the baby; and even after the baby is born the women has to take him around holding him in her arms since quail-fighting do the same walking around with their birds for them to get stronger and so too will the baby receive benefits from that movement and transmit that health and virtue to the body of the child that is being carried – just as being intemperant in pleasure generates a fluidity and humidity that causes weakness in the bones while if the woman restrain herself from breeding the uterus will be like an animal walking around her body to block her passageways leading to problems and diseases until she satisfy that desire of the female organ of reproducing.

In every other art and manufacture, the effects of the division of labour are similar to what they are in this very trifling one."

– The Wealth of Nations I: I, which right at the first chapter deals thus with specialization of labour and how powerful it is.

Yet we certainly understand how a skilled worker in an area performs better than an unskilled one we must promptly disagree with them about the benefits of such hyper-specialization; beyond the well-being necessary for the poor worker in question there is the point that rather than be that piece of machinery doing a single operation his entire life in the most inferior of human capacity, which is the bodily labour, it is infinitely more productive for them to exert their mind – it is not the specialized workers who can produce all those pins, it is the machine. A single worker can produce the pins at many times the rate by himself if he has the machine; and of course that was centuries ago so that in our modern society a single worker by himself can produce thousands of times what that collection of workers produced – or the autonomous machine can produce it all by itself.

It is the evolution of the art itself that leads to the greatest change and benefit to the state; a man who works and learn from all different fields of humankind is most able to advance them further and expand away from the tunnel-vision of those who know nothing else but a single operation – and a single man by the usage of his brain can literally be worth thousands of times more than the production of all other human hands combined, as all classic farmers and smith cannot compete with the boost in production that a single machine created for the purpose can perform.

It is not about the cooperation of super-specialized people, and much less the mindless fantasies of Heinrich that 'the cooperation of the whole of workers result in more than the sum of its parties', but simple understanding of reality in finding a more efficient way of doing something than by the direct employment of the ineffective bio-machinery of the human body.

Just as all must be ambidextrous since it is shameful to know how to do something with one hand and not with the other; creating such unbalance and depravation on their own bodies.

As clear by the twelve months of the year and the twelve gods ruling on the snow-clad many-topped Olympus that number is special and thus there has to be an exact number of families in the State to divide them in twelve tribes; so that each have their proper designed land and we can organize to each tribe to perform their proper festivals for each month, besides those of each day and where each will do their habitual sacrifices that have to be done before of each undertaking so that they may success with the approval of the gods.

On the beloved gymnastic and musical⁶² festivals we need some changes, however.

First the poets on the competition need to be at least fifty years old and to be good men who honour the laws of the State; then all of them have to sing something, to which he explicitly says that no matter if they are horrible singers or if there is no singing on their work – and so they should be voted by actually how virtuous he is instead of by any of his skills, and so too besides younger men not being allowed to participate nor those who are not judged to be virtuous by the State people cannot sing the music those young or un-virtuous men create no matter if they are the most beautiful songs in the world, ‘better than those of Orpheus’, since only those approved by the State and from good men are accepted to exist.

As for gymnastic they must fight emulating warfare, both on single pankration as in group fights, and they should honour who fights and live correctly while they must despise and abuse, as a double punishment, those who behave themselves shamefully without the courage to fight and compete virtuously; so that they must hide in ambush well before the festivals and attack each other in surprise rushes while they use ‘almost real’ weapons so that they are already ready and with real fear making the competition realistic – so that homicide is forgiven when it happens during the competitions since ‘soon others equally good will be born to take their place and what is bad for a State causing its ruin is not the loss of such individuals but to lose the fear of war and the virtue of being always ready and strong’.

Human are flawed and even surrounded with all virtue they can still feel evil desires and be ‘tempted at day and incited by night’; so when they feel like committing sacrilege or any other crime they should remember that the gods do not tempt people with bad things, nor are they tempted, so that instead it is ‘the madness of ancient crimes that have not been cleaned even today’; so that he has to go to the temple to make expiation and pray to heal his desires of criminality – and if such do not go away that he may remember that ‘death is more honourable than life, then free yourself from it’.

⁶² One of the rare occasions where Plato is actually right; that ‘musical’ comes from the Muses – it is truly the art of the muses, and it is thus used to refer to any art or more generally, as in this case, to all intellectual activities. In contrast to gymnastics, which refer to all physical activities.

Although suicide is portrayed little after as ‘the violence against your best friend’, himself, and which should never be done since it is base before the gods who gave him life; so that instead of expecting every criminal to regret his premeditation and suicide themselves without bothering anyone he follows with a better crime policy where the policing guards go after the criminals to properly enforce the law – his discourse, however, is not how to prepare such police force or any way of training or patrolling or even any judicial system to verify the accusations, but merely listing some random instances.

Focusing in how there has to be a different response if it is an old man beating a young one or the contrary; since just like the good is superior to the evil and men are to women so too are elder people to those younger, while the law also differs to foreigners and if amongst family members – with only the most heinous having a death penalty, as ‘killing someone intentionally using a storm’, but in the lighter ones there is exile or some punishment while involuntary ones are usually pardoned.

Applying that he exemplifies how it works then by saying that ‘there are two kinds of poison’ where one is that of medics and such who know substances that cause damage to people or to properties; these have to be fined for that – as for enchanters who make spells cursing others they have to be killed at once.

As for an animal that kills a person it has to be dismembered, ‘destroying it’, before throwing it outside the borders of the state; just as if a person falls down and hits his head against a rock or a tree so that the person dies then that inanimate thing is the culprit of the crime and it is necessary to perform the due rituals of expiations while the rock or thing has to be carried to the border to be thrown out of the country – any inanimate thing that someone falls upon or that falls upon someone has to be treated like the animal blamed with homicide.⁶³

⁶³ Now, I am sure this sounds too ridiculous already and it is comical to imagine how if someone slips in his bathroom and dies we have to break the floor of the house and throw on the neighbouring country the murder rubble, but far from some ancient stupidity of a former time when humankind was blinded by cultism it is something perfectly common in our very modern world – the billions of people who keep the mindless superstition that ‘there is something evil in the house’ or swears they can feel the ‘bad influences’.

Still today most so devoid of any intellect try to explain any undesirable thing that happens, as a fall or breaking anything, as a proof of their fantasy of the presence of evil spirits; with far from a harmless quirk of some is a crippling mental disability where they prejudice against all ‘non-virtuous people’ who believe anything different from them and as if carrying that imaginary plague they avoid all places such people with others opinions have owned and their objects as if it were all polluted by a demonic aura emanating from that unclean class of people who do not follow the same religion as himself – equally performing ridiculous rituals of prayers and such mystic expiatory purification when not throwing the item away or destroying it completely.

Such differ in nothing from Plato, and indeed here in the west the main religion is no more than a plagiarization of Platonic ideals, so that they are worthy of all derision and mockery; calling something a

Those are some meaningless actions performed for imaginary aims, but how less harmful than his law that if anyone is too good, or if he is good in many things, he then is a disturbance to the order of society as he breaks his mould to all and thus must be sent away; just as young people, explicitly saying that regardless of they being competent or not, cannot rule of older ones – and his laws are thus absolute models for always and ever being forbidden to change them or to create more laws.⁶⁴

The virtuous among the eldest rule thus as the class above the warriors, as he supports that inexistence relation between age and knowledge or wisdom, and it is up to the governor to make the festival where he decides who breeds with whom; since ‘women are weaker than men, but still there are those more virtuous one and more depraved ones just like dogs and horses have to be selected from the best so too we cannot let a virtuous female with a depraved male in order to beget the best just population’ – so that the ‘best men’ with great conquests of war have to be the ones who impregnate most women in order to produce many high-quality virtuous children while those crippled or with any deficient have to be with the depraved and crippled women and also hide their children in secret and obscure places far away from the schools of the virtuous children so that they will not contaminate them with their depravation.

After separating thus into their proper classes by merit they then have the women in common for the entire class as having private wives would deprive society from that fertile virtuous woman while the husband is at war or if he is unproductive; thus every women from twenty to forty years old and all men from thirty to fifty five are available to all on their class so that they may breed well the new generation – and so that they do not get distracted from their duties by the raising of children there are nurses kept apart just for the raising of children.

Although he does not deal with the problem that the poor old men will not have enough erection to fulfil the law of satisfying the empusae painted in white lead and fill every fetid hole before getting to where they want to enter in; as it would be necessary to establish such legislation so that they do not all pile upon the clear favourites – but of course such level of organization and planning to real world challenges is much more intelligent and well-thought than the Politeia.⁶⁵

‘religion’ is nothing changes the reality of being no more than a set of ideas, and which being a harmful disease to society it would be to the benefit of all humankind if it were to be extirpated.

⁶⁴ That last one is a direct critic to the practices of corrupt Athens flooding the constitution with new laws; and just like today exploring loop-holes to use technicalities to evade the intended effect of the law rather than ruling with any good sense – still, while his critic of the deranged democracy is beautiful, how much more inefficient and worse is his proposal against that democratic disease.

⁶⁵ “Βλέπωντος

καὶ πῶς ἡμᾶς τοὺς πρεσβύτας, ἣν ταῖς αἰσχυραῖσι συνῶμεν,
οὐκ ἐπυλείησι τὸ πῆος πρότερον πρὶν ἐκεῖσ’ οἱ φῆς ἀφικέσθαι;”

– ‘Εκκλησιάζουσai, Ecclesiazusae, 619-620, where thus the genial Aristophanes ridicules directly that concept

Without having a woman to call ‘mine’ nor children nor a house nor any property he will be free from having any individual sadness or happiness so that everyone together will have the same sadness and happiness, which are those of the State; and so they will never fight or be friends of some while not of others since they will all be brothers sharing everything, free from the worries of seeking for subsistence for their family or from impressing women or others with gifts and luxury or from serving the rich for reward as all will be maintained by the State so that they can do their job the best way possible as the only thing in their life – although it is unclear if that is the entire State or just the warrior class, but if a warrior flees from battle or show to be a coward or any such undesired thing he will be demoted to that lower class of artisans⁶⁶.

In that sharing they have to then perform in public their acts of worship and their orgies to show that they are truly doing them and doing so virtuously; so that it is against the law to do those things in private where others cannot judge if he is being honourable to the gods – they have to pray and fuck with gusto, but of course not in excess as they cannot be, as puts another author, ‘intemperant in their lewdness or insolent on their lust’.

However travels out of the Politeia then can only do so in official business of the State, as going to the temples and festivals of other estates, and only those above forty years old; and only those that are virtuous since we have to choose well for them to not be corrupted by the innovation of foreigners – so that if someone comes back worse than what he went, having learnt wrong things, he is to be put to death.

of sex in common; in his work about such revolutionary communities, made a decade and a half before the Politeia of Plato.

⁶⁶ It is unclear since as later it says that those who do not marry have to be punished by law, but the weaker should allow the stronger to have sons on their wives for the good of the State; just as the forced public education and the loss of rights by those judged coward and non-virtuous, the public eating without sauces and so on are just a paraphrase of the Lakedaemonian law where rather than soldier strength and discipline he directs them towards ‘virtue’ in general – so from the mixing of Attic and Cretan laws, besides the imperfect preservation and copies of it, we have some such weird contractions about the details.

There are details about if one does not have children after ten years married, or not marrying or not having children after some specific age, he has to be humiliated becoming unable to go to events, has to pay fines every year and no one can pay him any respect or obey what he says; married women that have no children being like a kind of virgin and so they cannot leave their house without the written authorization of their husbands while they cannot have sexual relations to others who are not also married; and even the numbers change, as the Laws mention women from sixteen to twenty as the best age and men from thirty to thirty five. But ignoring such details we have the mainpoint in how it is pure guesswork rather than any meaningful system.

Taking as example his fictions Atlantis where Poseidon is said to have built a perfect society of virtue just like the one he wants he thus opposes all change or progress; saying that ‘there is no greater evil to the States than those who introduce new ideas’ since ‘they will like the innovation and use of it, what is a dishonour to the old ones’ – which ‘old ones’, of course, are those holy habits and things left by the gods as the proper behaviour of humankind.

Imitating that imaginary idealized past that has never existed and trying to ‘conserve’ his own innovation of things that have never been performed; seeking that lost golden age only present in his incoherent dreams.⁶⁷

⁶⁷ “εἰ δ’ ἐθέλεις, ἕτερόν τοι ἐγὼ λόγον ἐκκορυφώσω
εὖ καὶ ἐπισταμένως, σὺ δ’ ἐνὶ φρεσὶ βάλλεο σῆσιν.
ὥς ὁμόθεν γεγάασι θεοὶ θνητοὶ τ’ ἄνθρωποι.

Χρῦσεον μὲν πρότιστα γένος μερόπων ἀνθρώπων
ἀθάνατοι ποίησαν Ὀλύμπια δώματ’ ἔχοντες.
οἱ μὲν ἐπὶ Κρόνου ἦσαν, ὅτ’ οὐρανῷ ἐμβασιλευν·
ὥστε θεοὶ δ’ ἔζων ἀκηδέα θυμὸν ἔχοντες,
νόσφιν ἄτερ τε πόνων καὶ οἰζύος· οὐδέ τι δειλὸν
γῆρας ἐπῆν, αἰεὶ δὲ πόδας καὶ χεῖρας ὁμοιοὶ
τέρποντ’ ἐν θαλίῃσι κακῶν ἔκτοσθεν ἀπάντων·
θνήσκον δ’ ὥσθ’ ὕπνῳ δεδμημένοι· ἐσθλὰ δὲ πάντα

τοῖσιν ἔην· καρπὸν δ’ ἔφερε ζεῖδωρος ἄρουρα
αὐτομάτη πολλόν τε καὶ ἄφθονον· οἱ δ’ ἐβελήμοι
ἥσυχoi ἔργ’ ἐνέμοντο σὺν ἐσθλοῖσιν πολέεσσιν.
[ἀφνειοὶ μῆλοισι, φίλοι μακάρεσσι θεοῖσιν.]
αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ τοῦτο γένος κατὰ γαῖ’ ἐκάλυψε,
τοὶ μὲν δαίμονές εἰσι Διὸς μεγάλου διὰ βουλὰς
ἐσθλοὶ, ἐπυχθόνιοι, φύλακες θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων,
οἳ ῥα φυλάσσουσιν τε δίκας καὶ σχέτλια ἔργα
ἡέρα ἐσάμενοι, πάντα φοιτῶντες ἐπ’ αἶαν,
πλουτοδοταὶ· καὶ τοῦτο γέρας βασιλῆον ἔσχον.
δεύτερον αὐτε γένος πολὺ χειρότερον μετόπισθεν
ἀργύρεον ποίησαν Ὀλύμπια δώματ’ ἔχοντες,
χρυσέῳ οὔτε φυῆν ἐναλίγκιον οὔτε νόημα.
ἀλλ’ ἐκατὸν μὲν παῖς ἔτεα παρὰ μητέρι κεδνῇ
ἐτρέφετ’ ἀτάλλων μέγα νήπιος ᾧ ἐνὶ οἴκῳ.
ἀλλ’ ὅτ’ ἄρ’ ἠβῆσαι τε καὶ ἠβης μέτρον ἵκοιτο,
παυρίδιον ζῶεσκον ἐπὶ χρόνον, ἄλγε’ ἔχοντες
ἀφραδίης· ὕβριν γὰρ ἀτάσθαλον οὐκ ἐδύναντο
ἀλλήλων ἀπέχειν, οὐδ’ ἀθανάτους θεραπεύειν
ἠθέλον οὐδ’ ἔρδειν μακάρων ἱεροῖς ἐπὶ βωμοῖς,
ἢ θέμις ἀνθρώποις κατὰ ἦθεα. τοὺς μὲν ἔπειτα
Ζεὺς Κρονίδης ἔκρυψε χολούμενος, οὐνεκα τιμὰς
οὐκ ἐδιδόν μακάρεσσι θεοῖς, οἳ Ὀλυμπον ἔχουσιν.
αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ καὶ τοῦτο γένος κατὰ γαῖ’ ἐκάλυψε,

τοὶ μὲν ὑποχθόνιοι μάκαρες θνητοῖς καλέονται,
 δεύτεροι, ἀλλ' ἔμπης τιμὴ καὶ τοῖσιν ὀπηδεῖ.
 Ζεὺς δὲ πατὴρ τρίτον ἄλλο γένος μερόπων ἀνθρώπων
 χάλκειον ποίησ', οὐκ ἀργυρέω οὐδὲν ὁμοῖον,
 ἐκ μελῶν, δεινὸν τε καὶ ὀβριμον· οἷσιν Ἄρης
 ἔργ' ἐμελεν στονόεντα καὶ ὕβριες· οὐδέ τι σῖτον
 ἤσθιον, ἀλλ' ἀδάμαντος ἔχον κρατερόφρονα θυμόν·
 ἄπλαστοι· μεγάλη δὲ βίη καὶ χεῖρες ἄαπτοι
 ἐξ ὧμων ἐπέφυκον ἐπὶ στιβαροῖσι μέλεσσιν.
 τῶν δ' ἦν χάλκεα μὲν τεύχεα, χάλκεοι δὲ τε οἴκοι,
 χαλκῷ δ' εἰργάζοντο· μέλας δ' οὐκ ἔσκε σίδηρος.

καὶ τοὶ μὲν χεῖρεσσιν ὕπο σφετέρῃσι δαμέντες
 βῆσαν ἐς εὐρώεντα δόμον κρυεροῦ Αἰδάο
 νόονυμοι· θάνατος δὲ καὶ ἐκπάγλους περ ἐόντας
 εὔλε μέλας, λαμπρόν δ' ἔλιπον φάος ἡλείοιο.
 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ καὶ τοῦτο γένος κατὰ γαί' ἐκάλυψεν,
 αὐτίς ἔτ' ἄλλο τέταρτον ἐπὶ χθονὶ πουλυβοτείρῃ
 Ζεὺς Κρονίδης ποίησε, δικαιότερον καὶ ἄρειον,
 ἀνδρῶν ἡρώων θεῖον γένος, οἱ καλέονται
 ἡμίθεοι, προτέρη γενεὴ κατ' ἀπείρονα γαῖαν.
 καὶ τοὺς μὲν πόλεμός τε κακὸς καὶ φύλοψ αἰνὴ
 τοὺς μὲν ὑφ' ἑπταπύλῳ Θῆβῃ, Καδμηίδι γαίῃ,
 ὤλεσε μαρναμένους μῆλων ἔνεκ' Οἰδιπόδαο,
 τοὺς δὲ καὶ ἐν νήεσσιν ὑπὲρ μέγα λαῖτμα θαλάσσης
 ἐς Τροίην ἀγαγὼν Ἑλένης ἔνεκ' ἠκυόμοιο.
 ἔνθ' ἦ τοι τοὺς μὲν θανάτου τέλος ἀμφεκάλυψε,
 τοῖς δὲ δίχ' ἀνθρώπων βίοντα καὶ ἦθε' ὀπάσσας
 Ζεὺς Κρονίδης κατένασσε πατὴρ ἐς πείρατα γαίης.
 [...]

καὶ τοὶ μὲν ναίουσιν ἀκηδέα θυμόν ἔχοντες
 ἐν μακάρων νήσοισι παρ' Ὠκεανὸν βαθυδίνην·
 ὄλβιοι ἦρωες, τοῖσιν μελιθεά καρπὸν
 τρις ἔτεος θάλλοντα φέρει ζεῖδωρος ἄρουρα.

[τηλοῦ ἀπ' ἀθανάτων· τοῖσιν Κρόνος ἐμβασιλεύει.
 τοῦ γὰρ δεσμὸν ἔλυσεν πατέρη ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε,
 τοῖσιν δ' ἄρ ν>εάτοις τιμῇ<ν καὶ κῦδος ὅπασσεν.
 οὐδέ θ' ὁμῶς κλυτὸν ἄ>λλο γένος θῆκ' <εὐρύοπα Ζεὺς
 ἀνδρῶν, οἷ> γεγάσιν ἐπὶ <χθονὶ πουλυβοτείρῃ.]

μηκέτ' ἔπειτ' ὄφελλον ἐγὼ πέμποισι μετεῖναι
 ἀνδράσιν, ἀλλ' ἦ πρόσθε θανεῖν ἢ ἔπειτα γενέσθαι.
 νῦν γὰρ δὴ γένος ἐστί σιδήρεον· οὐδέ ποτ' ἡμᾶρ
 παύσονται καμάτου καὶ οἰζύος, οὐδέ τι νύκτωρ
 φθειρόμενοι· χαλεπὰς δὲ θεοὶ δώσουσι μερίμνας.
 ἀλλ' ἔμπης καὶ τοῖσι μεμείζεται ἐσθλὰ κακοῖσιν.
 Ζεὺς δ' ὀλέσει καὶ τοῦτο γένος μερόπων ἀνθρώπων,
 εὖτ' ἂν γεινόμενοι πολιορκόταφοι τελέθωσιν.

Children cannot make-up new kinds of games then; the education, games and sports of the children have to never be changed since children who play differently from their ancestors will be different adults from their ancestors wanting other things and other laws – and since the ancestors were the gods themselves and those pious to them all that change will only lead to the vituperation of everything that was virtuous in the past by making them depraved and base by change.

There is much argumentation for intelligent design in justifying his laws, but I will leave that discussion out; which you can see treated on my *On the Origin of Subatomic Species* – and here we can just mention how he divided three kinds of heretics.

Those who do not fully believe the gods, those who seeing suffering say that the gods do not interfere in human matters and those who treat sin lightly by believing that they can do it with impunity since it suffices to ask for, or buy, the pardon with offerings; which he follows with his combo in how the planets have to be moved by divine power as nothing ‘natural’ could do it much less be only rocks in the sky showing intelligent design, then with the good things in nature that an artisan cannot make the whole so perfect and forget to give attention to the details to then finally that those chariot drivers who sell the game beforehand or sailors who by wine and fat sink the ship selling themselves for gold or any other pleasure are badly seen as iniquitous so that the gods being just and good would never accept such payments rather than true virtue – to which combo if the person is not convinced there is the punishment of those who treat these matters with irony to whom just one or two death is not punishment enough while those who do not use

οὐδὲ πατὴρ παίδεσσιν ὁμοίος οὐδέ τι παῖδες,
οὐδὲ ξείνος ξεινοδόκῳ καὶ ἐταῖρος ἐταίρῳ,
οὐδὲ κασίγνητος φίλος ἔσσεται, ὥς τὸ πάρος περ.
αἶψα δὲ γηράσκοντας ἀτιμήσουσι τοκῆας·
μέμνονται δ’ ἄρα τοὺς χαλεποὺς βάζοντες ἔπεσσι,
σχέτλιοι, οὐδὲ θεῶν ὄπιν εἰδότες· οὐδέ κεν οἱ γε
γηράντεσσι τοκεῦσιν ἀπὸ θρεπτήρια δοῖεν
[χειροδίκαι· ἕτερος δ’ ἐτέρου πόλιν ἐξαλαπάξει.]
οὐδέ τις εὐόρκου χάρις ἔσσεται οὔτε δικαίου
οὔτ’ ἀγαθοῦ, μᾶλλον δὲ κακῶν ῥεκτῆρα καὶ ὕβριν
ἀνέρα τιμήσουσι· δίκη δ’ ἐν χερσὶ, καὶ αἰδῶς
οὐκ ἔσται· βλάβη δ’ ὁ κακὸς τὸν ἀρεῖονα φῶτα
μῦθοισιν σκολιοῖς ἐνέπων, ἐπὶ δ’ ὄρκον ὁμῆται.
ζῆλος δ’ ἀνθρώποισιν οἰζυροῖσιν ἅπασι
δυσκέλαδος κακόχαρτος ὁμαρτήσῃ, στυγερῶπης,
καὶ τότε δὴ πρὸς Ὀλυμπον ἀπὸ χθονὸς εὐρυοδείης
λευκοῖσιν φάρεσσι καλυψαμένῳ χροῖα καλὸν
ἀθανάτων μετὰ φύλον ἵτον προλιπόντ’ ἀνθρώπους
Αἰδῶς καὶ Νέμεσις· τὰ δὲ λείπεται ἄλγεα λυγρὰ
θνητοῖς ἀνθρώποισι, κακοῦ δ’ οὐκ ἔσσεται ἀλκή.”

– *Ἔργα καὶ ἡμέραι*, *Works And Days*, 106-201, where thus Hesiod describes the fantasies of past ages of virtue and living free of all suffering; so that his time is that worst of times where soon ‘sons will be killing fathers and we will be abandoned by the gods to dwell in our own eternal misery as we on our impiety refuse to obey the gods’.

of irony are only fined and imprisoned until they get to the stage of starting to believe but still doubting the daily miracles of the gods so that they go to a special prison for at least five years, and more if they do not learn, and after being reform they are freed to which if they start saying blasphemies again they are punished with death at once as ‘death is the only cure to minds woven by destiny to be thus’.

While Aristoteles is more direct; where after teaching the methods of analysis to verbally win discussions he says that ‘But there are questions that do not even need to be considered; as those who instead of arguments require punishment or perception – as if someone questioning if he should or not honour the gods what he deserves is punishment.’.⁶⁸

It is clear how wholly ignorant of any matter he is and how blind to the management of any institution he is; believing that the world is only degenerating he puts forth the immutable laws not believing that the conduct of war or the production of food will ever change nor any new commodities and things in life be found with all such innovations being trifling distractions from the life of virtue – the point is not about how bad it aged, but the reason why that is so, which is that his ideas are mere moral guesswork of what ‘should’ or ‘should not’ be rather than any scientific analysis of what ‘is’ and what ‘will be’.

He literally comes out and say that ‘human matters are not worthy of any great attention, but even so we must treat of them’; since ‘men are like the playthings of the deity and this is their better characteristics’ so that all have to live in the way that makes them better and more beautiful in fulfilling that function – with the reasoning that ‘we should not worry trying to explain these things since that is not holy’ arguing that it suffices to trust the ancient laws from the gods and serve them as the only occupation and worry we have without trying to understand the ‘order of the world’ or even the deities themselves as ‘it is evil and a lack of virtue for people to know too much’.

And with the highest pitch of disorder that can possibly arise in the human mind we have Xenophon confirming that Socrates truly taught so; in saying that ‘Geometry, for example, is enough for him to know how to measure the land for buying or selling, to know how to correctly distribute some inheritance and to measure the work of the labourer, but to go too far on things that leave the mind perplexed is not approved; as astronomy to know the hours of the night from

⁶⁸ «Οὐ δεῖ δὲ πᾶν πρόβλημα οὐδὲ πᾶσαν θέσιν ἐπισκοπεῖν, ἀλλ’ ἢν ἀπορήσειεν ἄν τις τῶν λόγου δεομένων καὶ μὴ κολάσεως ἢ αἰσθήσεως· οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἀποροῦντες « Πότερον δεῖ τοὺς θεοὺς τιμᾶν καὶ τοὺς γονεῖς ἀγαπᾶν ἢ οὐ » κολάσεως δέονται, οἱ δὲ « Πότερον ἢ χιὼν λευκὴ ἢ οὐ » αἰσθήσεως.»

– Τοπικά, Topics, I: 12, and ‘upon questioning if the snow is white what he needs is perception’; he himself blind to the ambiguity of colours or any word which represents human concepts rather than any perfect Platonic form made by the gods or any rigorously defined thing.

“مَنْ كَفَرَ بِاللَّهِ مِنْ بَعْدِ إِيْمَانِهِ إِلَّا مِنْ أَكْثَرِهِ وَقَلِيلِهِ مُطْمَئِنِّ بِالْإِيْمَانِ وَلَكِنْ مَنْ شَرَحَ بِالْكُفْرِ صَدْرًا فَعَلَيْهِمْ عَذَابٌ مِنَ اللَّهِ وَلَهُمْ عَذَابٌ عَظِيمٌ”
– قُرْءَانُ, Quran, XVI: 106, while here we have the promise of a specially horrible suffering to those who dare to ‘disbelief completely’.

the stars and the day of the month and the seasons of the year to always be ready to take his post on the watch and to travel without getting lost is good, but to study too much to discern the distance of the stars and their orbit is wrong – one cannot examine the nature too much if the Creator made the universe thus with parts that he judged as right to hide from men, like the sun that is visible to all men, but which is not to be examined with too much curiosity for the punishment to those who dare to do so is blindness’.

Thus about the most basic necessity and an example so relevant ever since always up to today is the preoccupation in obtaining aliment; which valid considerations are how to feed everyone, how to obtain a greater variety so that they are more tasty and healthy, how to obtain on a sustainable way so that there is such on the future without depleting everything so that they do not pay ten thousand times more for the carelessness of the present, how to make the work easier so that others can contribute or automatize it freeing more people to other contribution, how to make it stable against the nature as diseases or drought and destructive climate and so on

But to him such ‘work smarter not harder’ is shameful for he advocates that it is the hardness that dignifies the man; so that he goes in details saying how to fish with hooks is the mark of laziness and to leave out nets at night or to use traps for birds and things like that is an indolent deprivation of society – for the only way of hunting has to be the manly and virtuous one using of his health to actively run after the prey and overcome it since all the passive others cultivate vice into people just as all innovation changing the tradition.

We see then over two thousand years ago that exact critic at the ‘lazy works’ of employing more efficient means to increase production, but what mattered to him was the ‘virtue of labour’ not the tangible and real results⁶⁹; the metempsychosis of ‘real value’ about having absolutely nothing unique or noteworthy about it, and Plato extendeds it further to everything in life – Heinrich was just too stupid thinking himself an unequalled genius on his ‘discoveries of the true nature of things’ to see how worthless and non-original such insane conservative moralisms are.

‘It is impossible for a man to be rich and good’ is a common phrase, as mentioned above, to win over the masses; copied even by religion besides that of the political parties by the overwhelming popular appeal of it antagonizing the rich in order to obtain the support of the majority – but Plato says it truly believing it.

And thus the perfect location of his State, of the capital city at least, is away from the sea since a port brings wealth and all such things that awake vices and evil in men; so too they would have to

⁶⁹ That is, a value attached by his imagination of merit rather than any real consequence of it; what quite looks like a law of Solon, called by Herodotus ‘so just that no one could find fault with it’, where everyone had to report at the end of the year what was their profession from which they made their livelihood for it to be judged if it was a worthy profession or if he deserved death instead.

use the worthless iron coins of Sparta since they are cumbersome and hold virtually no value outside instead of precious metals which beget corruption and niggardness in men like the shining owls of Laurium⁷⁰ – not one consideration to conform or the improvement of life, but with eyes blinded by his imaginary aims with plans that in no way reflect any positive result in reality.

Likewise he says that ‘walls have to be of bronze and iron, not of earth’; since by not having walls to protect them, ‘to hide behind’, they will be courageous and virtues rather than passive and lazy – it will make them always alert and make them actively fight against the enemy forming a wall of their metal shields ‘letting the earth sleep without being risen’.⁷¹

Ignoring such considerations and problems he rather to go about the different kinds of fruit available; as a pomegrade which the foreigners passing by deserve hospitality so they can take those they find on their way just like those above thirty years old can, but that younger people or

⁷⁰ The mining town of Attica where Athens got its immense wealth; the owls with their shining eyes are the symbol of glaucous Athena and the coins not only had the bird in alto-rilievo, but where just called ‘owls’, ‘glaukes’ – Sparta would thus live in austerity and train hardened soldiers, as idealized by Plato, while Athens was filled with luxury and would use its wealth as its greatest power in war.

“Λακεδαιμονίων γὰρ εἰ ἡ πόλις ἐρημωθεῖ, λειφθεῖ δὲ τὰ τε ἱερὰ καὶ τῆς κατασκευῆς τὰ ἐδάφη, πολλὴν ἂν οἶμαι ἀπιστίαν τῆς δυνάμεως προελθόντος πολλοῦ χρόνου τοῖς ἔπειτα πρὸς τὸ κλέος αὐτῶν εἶναι (καίτοι Πελοποννήσου τῶν πέντε τὰς δύο μοίρας νέμονται, τῆς τε ζυμπάσης ἡγοῦνται καὶ τῶν ἔξω ζυμμάχων πολλῶν· ὁμοῦ δὲ οὔτε ζυνοικισθείσης πόλεως οὔτε ἱεροῖς καὶ κατασκευαῖς πολυτελέσι χρησαμένης, κατὰ κόμας δὲ τῷ παλαιῷ τῆς Ἑλλάδος τρόπῳ οἰκισθείσης, φαίνεται’ ἂν ὑποδεεστέρα), Ἀθηναίων δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ τοῦτο παθόντων διπλασίαν ἂν τὴν δύναμιν εἰκάζεσθαι ἀπὸ τῆς φανεραῆς ὅψεως τῆς πόλεως ἢ ἔστιν.”

– Ιστορία του Πελοποννησιακοῦ Πολέμου, History of the Peloponnesian War, I: 10, where the often sane Thucydides comes out in the defence of the fantastical absurdities of folder historians rather than concrete archeological evidence; saying that if Sparta was desolated so that we were to find only the foundations of the buildings then we would refuse to accept its fame and the extent of its power, while at Athens we would suppose it to be twice its actual greatness if we were to judge by that appearance of the temples and public buildings.

⁷¹ Aristoteles comments on how stupid that policy is; and how destructive to the State – an idea which, naturally, comes from Sparta being the legendary wall-less city.

And which he would never live to see it, but as if he was right the city was conquered and forced to abandon the rituals of brutal Lycurgus just a few decades after they adopted the construction of walls around the city.

Which Platonic laws I like to compare to the worthless faith that by playing a lute one can make stones float and build by themselves the colossal walls the link the seven towered-gates, as Amphion is said to have done; which hopeless wasteful endeavour is like all such normative regulations – when only exact science can first comprehend the phenomena of the physical world to then answer how to properly build an ideal wall, or answer how to end hunger, disease and death in contrast to the magical solutions of faith just waiting in vain to be rewarded with perfection for doing nothing to produce such perfect state of things.

“城復于隍，其命亂也。”

– 易經: ䷊ 泰 , YiJing: Tai, VII, where it says that when the walls return to the dirt of the fosse then the government has already become disorder; or literally ‘city-walls return to dry-fosse, then order confusion’.

those who are not virtuous are not allowed to take pomegrate from the tree of others like that – and so on he goes about different laws and punishment to the different kinds of perpetrators, different kinds of fruits and different seasons.

‘States rarely fall by war, but by the internal depravation of the race’ sounds exactly as Plato, as it is the same normative disease, and we saw the results of it as its author brought into fruition such ideas; saying indeed that after his loved Teuton element of the Arians the Greeks were the second best race of humankind.

Truly the lebensraum of the third Reich was an empire expanding further while the Politeia had that limited population not counting slaves, but that difference is mostly in appearance as Plato declares that there have to be left no neighbours to bother them so that they may have all the living space they want; with both sinisterly criticizing their mighty naval fleet with the argument that ‘we are not used to it and it is bad to try the specialty of others’ so thus blaming the lack of virtue in breaking of traditions as the causes of defeat since they should have fought on land to ‘trust in the virtue of the training of the solders rather than on the inferior arts of craftsmen’ – both thus despising the global commerce and production of goods to sell rather than the self-sufficient of locally producing all necessary for life.

If they do so observing all these laws then he says that they will be powerful and defeat all enemies as they have both the hard discipline of ‘real men’ and the help of the gods; and in respect of which, of course, the slaves made from the conquests are only from the barbarians races the other Hellenic states are brothers to them who sprouted from the earth there rather than coming from a foreign land – nor can they be mixed with such slaves and inferior races as, says his disciple, ‘the best people come from the best; to be well-born is a virtue of the race’.

If they do this, then, all the sons will grow virtuous well-taught without ever leaving the teachings; and so there will no longer be any crime nor sedition nor adultery nor lack of respect to the elders nor impiety – which is the cause of all evil and so the children⁷² will make a just and good world where all pleasure of the flesh is substituted by true felicity of being temperate knowing that he is doing the absolute justice of the gods where even more blessings will come on the next life.

That is what he says and often says that ‘there are innumerable benefits’ when presenting some law, but then does not deign to provide any such tangible benefit; and much at the contrary those who live without such live a much more pleasant life by enjoy the harmless good things at disposal and not fearing retribution from inexistent supernatural beings who would be watching them always.

On the conclusion of his Politics Aristoteles asks ‘What is the best life that someone can have?’; where obviously on his entire philosophy it is a life of virtue, or what set of irrational behaviours

⁷² Under the effect of that brain-washing.

and devotion to the gods he calls ‘virtue’, and the best State is naturally one that gives such to its citizens – and the best to an individual is obviously also the best to the estate, he does that logical jump, and therefore just as the more virtuous one individual is the happier he is then it is the goal of the estate to be also virtuous and the purpose of the laws is to cultivate virtue in people.

Thus the only result is clearly that they attain perfect lives where everyone will be the most happy possible.

So well he resumed how are born such insane institution for from the fetishes of ‘morality’ the laws come; and even worse they are made for the immediate gratification of what they think better on the moment and not existing any interest on the future or the improvements of progress because their virtue is immutable – so besides being stagnated they lack also all real benefit, but only harvest the hell of the crazed moralism of how they want to force all to act as it pleases them.

Thus none tries, nor is able, to offer instructions of cause and result to then talk of how such is a good in the world; they only vomit how they think that people should behave and that society then should force all to be like that which he finds pretty – without any relation to palpable benefits on the real world.

His goal with all such norms is in ‘moderation’ or ‘temperance’; which is the means to cultivate ‘virtue’.

Too much fear is cowardice, but too little is insolence; while bravery is the moderate virtue amid both – a coward flees from war in dishonour and an insolent one jumps on a well while not knowing how to swim, thus it is not tolerable that such fool be called ‘brave’ as if his lack of fear were a virtue.

Like drinking too much or too little water is harmful so too everything else in life is with the vices that cause evil being the lack or excess while what is good is always the moderation between such; we praise strength and speed in sports, but in melodies we can praise smooth delicacy and slow rhythm – for we do not praise the characteristics themselves, but the moderation in being used correctly as a virtue.

Thus the Holy Scriptures say that ‘even pleasant sweet sleep, in excess, becomes unbearable pain’⁷³, since on its most extreme form sweet sleep is bitter death.

⁷³ “ἔστι δὲ τερπομένοισιν ἀκούμεν· οὐδὲ τί σε χρή,
πρὶν ὥρη, καταλέχθαι· ἀνίη καὶ πολὺς ὕπνος.”

– Οδύσσεια, Odyssey, XV: 393-394, more literally ‘you should not sleep before the time; for even sleeping too much is pain’.

‘Intemperance even of pleasure defeats its own purpose for if a walk on the finest day on the most beautiful county is pursued too far it ends in pain and fatigue; the healthiest and tastiest food if eaten unrestrained of appetite produces weakness rather than strength and disgust rather than gusto – and even in intellectual pleasures if they are sought with little intermission they debilitate the body and impair the vigour of the mind.’⁷⁴

On the Olympiads and elections it is necessary to impose the seriousness of the law making everything proceed on its due form and details; as for in festivities and at funerals they have to be joyful and mournful, perhaps respectively, instead of enforcing details or expressing the wrong quality – the virtue to be praised on each is different for virtue is not on any characteristics but on the moderation with which all things are done.⁷⁵

Respect without moderation becomes adulation; precaution timidity, bravery disorder and sincerity rudeness – confidence conceit, apprehension cowardice, optimism imprudence and pessimism listlessness.⁷⁶

So that Plato guessed, or better inferred, the existence of the Zhong^中, of ‘virtue’ or such correct and optimal way to achieve something, but he was wholly delusional in trying to impose his own purposeless tastes as the Yong^庸, that which measures all under the heavens and defines what ‘virtue’ is; he called it of deity while others called it nature, but none gets close to the Unity which when unrolled encompasses everything in the universe and when rolled it is a single principle which penetrates all things – both by physical necessity as a logical one it requires the most simple, and testable, thing that explains and replicates every observed phenomena.⁷⁷

⁷⁴ I paraphrase Malthus from An Essay on the Principle of Population XI.

⁷⁵ “林放問禮之本。子曰：「大哉問！禮，與其奢也，寧儉；喪，與其易也，寧戚。」”

– 論語：八佾, Lunyu: Ba Yi, IV, where upon being asked about the due behaviour in rituals it is thus answered that modest temperance is the true virtue so that one can act proper on each different occasion.

⁷⁶ “子曰：「恭而無禮則勞，慎而無禮則蕙，勇而無禮則亂，直而無禮則絞。君子篤於親，則民興於仁；故舊不遺，則民不偷。」”

– 論語：泰伯, Lunyu: Tai Bo, II, where with much less logic and structure it is thus presented the contrast of ‘good qualities’ when immoderate.

⁷⁷ “子程子曰：「不偏之謂中，不易之謂庸。中者，天下之正道；庸者，天下之定理。」此篇乃孔門傳授心法。子思恐其久而差也，故筆之於書，以授孟子。其書始言一理，中散為萬事，末復合為一理。「放之則彌六合，卷之則退藏於密」，其味無窮，皆實學也。善讀者玩索而有得焉，則終身用之，有不能盡者矣。”

– 中庸章句, Zhong Yong Zhangju, with the introduction commentary of Xi, 朱熹. It, in a much vaguer and ambiguous way, arrives at the same result as Plato so wonderfully exposed throughout his dialogues; that

We can say he is perfectly right in such logic of deduction that just as white and black are opposite, but are both colours, so too excess and scarcity, although opposites, are both evils on the form of immoderation; so that the good that contradicts them is moderation itself – if thus a note sounds too flat or too sharp it is painful, but in due proportion it is pleasant, and too bitter or too sweet is offensive, and the pleasure of taste comes from the equilibrium of each, just as that which is too hot or too cold causes destruction and pain to the senses while on the right measure they produce health and are pleasing.⁷⁸

He fails by the fantastic metaphysical inferences of the perfect forms of virtual as defined by the inter-dimensinal deity; defining ‘morality’ as ‘the will of the deity’⁷⁹ is where all his words lose all meaning in the real world – he himself reduces that to the lack of knowledge of what is the best to himself so that they take wrong decisions by ignorance as no man would do that which he thinks to be bad for himself⁸⁰, but then goes about with said government of forced ignorance and that

moderation is the true virtue that regulates all others, but then they differ in what is the measuring power that defines virtue.

⁷⁸ “Ἐτι ὅταν μὴ ἡ ἐναντίον τῷ γένει, σκοπεῖν μὴ μόνον εἰ τὸ ἐναντίον ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ γένει, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ἀνὰ μέσον· ἐν ᾧ γὰρ τὰ ἄκρα, καὶ τὸ ἀνὰ μέσον, οἷον ἐπὶ λευκοῦ καὶ μέλανος· τὸ γὰρ χρῶμα γένος τούτων τε καὶ τῶν ἀνὰ μέσον χρωμάτων ἀπάντων. (Ἐνστασις ὅτι ἡ μὲν ἔνδεια καὶ ἡ ὑπερβολὴ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ γένει – ἐν τῷ κακῷ γὰρ ἄμφω – τὸ δὲ μέτριον ἀνὰ μέσον ὃν τούτων οὐκ ἐν τῷ κακῷ ἀλλ’ ἐν τῷ ἀγαθῷ.)”
– Τοπικά, Topics, IV: 3, where Aristotle thus uses the colours as opposite comparing it with evil.

“εἰ δ’ ἡ φωνὴ συμφωνία τις ἐστίν, ἡ δὲ φωνὴ καὶ ἡ ἀκοὴ ἔστιν ὥς ἐν ἐστὶ [καὶ ἔστιν ὥς οὐχ ἐν τὸ αὐτό], λόγος δ’ ἡ συμφωνία, ἀνάγκη καὶ τὴν ἀκοὴν λόγον τινὰ εἶναι. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο καὶ φθείρει ἕκαστον ὑπερβάλλον, καὶ τὸ ὀξὺ καὶ τὸ βαρὺ, τὴν ἀκοὴν· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἐν χυμοῖς τὴν γεῦσιν, καὶ ἐν χρώμασι τὴν ὄψιν τὸ σφοδρὰ λαμπρὸν ἢ ζοφερὸν, καὶ ἐν ὀσφρῆσει ἡ ἰσχυρὰ ὀσμὴ, καὶ γλυκεῖα καὶ πικρά, ὥς λόγου τινὸς ὄντος τῆς αἰσθήσεως. διὸ καὶ ἡδέα μὲν, ὅταν εὐκρινὴ καὶ ἄμικτα ὄντα ἄγῃται εἰς τὸν λόγον, οἷον τὸ ὀξὺ ἢ γλυκὺ ἢ ἄλμυρόν, ἡδέα γὰρ τότε· ὅλως δὲ μᾶλλον τὸ μικτόν, συμφωνία, ἡ τὸ ὀξὺ ἢ βαρὺ, ἀφῇ δὲ τὸ θερμαντὸν ἢ ψυκτόν· ἡ δ’ αἰσθησις ὁ λόγος· ὑπερβάλλοντα δὲ λύει ἢ φθείρει.”

– Περί Ψυχῆς, About the Soul, III: 2, where he compares the extremes with pain and destruction of the senses and the moderate as pleasure; a rather succinct and clear explanation which cannot be found in Plato since he writes cryptically in his artful prose so that you have to put it all together from the general idea of the whole.

⁷⁹ As in Zarath where ‘the will of Mazda is the law of justice’; with those imaginary norm of their fictitious gods being what determinates the good and proper measure of how all things should be done.

⁸⁰ “Μεταλάβωμεν δὴ τὰ ὀνόματα πάλιν τὸ ἡδὺ τε καὶ ἀνιαρὸν ἐπὶ τοῖς αὐτοῖς τούτοις, καὶ λέγωμεν ὅτι Ἄνθρωπος πράττει τότε μὲν ἐλέγομεν τὰ κακά, νῦν δὲ λέγωμεν τὰ ἀνιάρ, γινώσκων ὅτι ἀνιάρ ἐστίν, ἡττώμενος ὑπὸ τῶν ἡδέων, δῆλον ὅτι ἀναξίων ὄντων νικᾷ. καὶ τίς ἄλλη ἀναξία ἡδονῇ πρὸς λύπην ἐστίν, ἀλλ’ ἡ ὑπερβολὴ ἀλλήλων καὶ ἑλλειψις; ταῦτα δ’ ἐστὶ μείζω τε καὶ σμικρότερα γινόμενα ἀλλήλων καὶ πλείω καὶ ἐλάττω καὶ μᾶλλον καὶ ἥττον. εἰ γὰρ τις λέγοι ὅτι ἀλλὰ πολὺ διαφέρει, ὃ Σώκρατες, τὸ παραχρημα ἡδὺ τοῦ εἰς τὸν ὕστερον χρόνον καὶ ἡδέος καὶ λυπηροῦ, μὴν ἄλλω τῷ, φαίην ἂν ἔγωγε, ἡ ἡδονὴ καὶ λύπη; οὐ γὰρ ἔσθ’ ὅτῳ ἄλλω. ἀλλ’ ὥσπερ ἀγαθὸς ἰστάναι ἄνθρωπος, συνθεῖς τὰ ἡδέα καὶ συνθεῖς τὰ

such ‘knowledge’ is not about the scientific truth of how the world works and thus how to truly achieve the desired results but ‘knowledge of what the deity commands us to do in their honour’.

Therefore we have the admitted fact that there are songs that say what is right pleasing the gods and because of that they are good for people; and therefore there are songs that are not so and thus they are wrong and bad for people – for what is good is virtuous, and what is bad is not virtuous, and what is virtuous is useful for people to live a happy life being virtuous and good, but what is not virtuous is not useful for the good of people and so it is either useless or bad for them.

And at everything else in life the same principle is applied; ‘it is obvious to everyone that the perfection of nature proves the existence of the gods and the blessings that they are good and that they know everything and that they care about what we do’ – and thus we have to follow their wise will for they know what is best for us.

λυπηρά, καὶ τὸ ἐγγὺς καὶ τὸ πόρρω στήσας ἐν τῷ ζυγῷ, εἶπε πότερα πλείω ἐστίν. ἐὰν μὲν γὰρ ἡδέα πρὸς ἡδέα ἰστίης, τὰ μείζω ἀεὶ καὶ πλείω ληπτέα: ἐὰν δὲ λυπηρά πρὸς λυπηρά, τὰ ἐλάττω καὶ σμικρότερα: ἐὰν δὲ ἡδέα πρὸς λυπηρά, ἐὰν μὲν τὰ ἀνιαρά ὑπερβάλληται ὑπὸ τῶν ἡδέων, ἐάντε τὰ ἐγγὺς ὑπὸ τῶν πόρρω ἐάντε τὰ πόρρω ὑπὸ τῶν ἐγγύς, ταύτην τὴν πρᾶξιν πρακτέον ἐν ᾗ ἂν ταῦτ' ἐνῇ: ἐὰν δὲ τὰ ἡδέα ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνιαρῶν, οὐ πρακτέα. μή τι ἄλλη ἔχει, φαίην ἂν, ταῦτα, ὧ ἄνθρωποι; οἷδ' ὅτι οὐκ ἂν ἔχοιεν ἄλλως λέγειν.”

- Πρωταγόρας, Protagoras, 355e-356g, this most wonderful part of his doctrines; where ‘people are deceived by the distance’ thinking some immediate pleasure that is right before their eyes to be greater than that of the immense reward of righteousness which awaits afar in the future just as they think the mountain of future punishment to be small and the tiny immediate privation to be gigantic.

“For all men are by nature provided of notable multiplying glasses (that is their passions and self-love) through which every little playment appeareth a great grievance, but are destitute of those prospective glasses (namely moral and civil science) to see afar off the miseries that hang over them and cannot without such payments be avoided.”

- Leviathan II: XVIII, which we can so well add to the above in how their own preferences then are as multiplying glasses distorting that reality even further; so thus they take such path of insane norms as they follow such fantastical visions rather than the scientific reality.

“καὶ οὐκ ἴσμεν ὅπως τὰδε τριῶν τῶν μεγίστων ζυμφορῶν ἀπὴλλακται, ἀζυνεσίας ἢ μαλακίας ἢ ἀμελείας.”

- Ιστορία του Πελοποννησιακού Πολέμου, History of the Peloponnesian War, I: 123, where so it is listed by a Lakedaimonian the three greatest errors; that of lack of understanding, cowardice and carelessness’.

But by the Platonic reduction to mere knowledge it is obvious that is the only flaw; it is not possible for one to be a coward and flee from something if he understands that such will be worse for him leading to ever more dreadful horrors, just as it is not possible to be careless if one knows the proper course of action – and so on all failures, of deficiency or excess, are due to that twisted and flawed knowledge, although Plato then processes unnecessarily to the stupidity that such ‘knowledge’ is not about the actual reality before his eyes but those worthless norms of his imaginary deities.

All Plato did was to expound the pure and inevitable derivation of the existence of that creator; and as ‘in order to become hotter a thing has to be colder before, and to become colder to have been hotter previously, or to become heavier to have been lighter before, or to become lighter to have been heavier, so too to die we have had to have been alive before, but to have been alive we have had to be in the condition of death before; and that is the immortal soul which lives eternally and whose virtue is judged by the gods⁸¹ to reincarnate in this plane of suffering and trial or to leave the cave to join them in their perfect world⁸²’ – so that even if something seems awful and begetting only suffering with no benefits we can still know that it has a purpose as a test in leading us to paradise after since ‘the world here is just a sojourn along the way’⁸³.

⁸¹ The argument for the existence of an immortal soul, as shown in *Phaedo*; to which later he uses of the ‘self-moving’ power also in the argument for the ‘soul’.

⁸² The so famous illustration of the ‘cave’; which means that sickening belief rather than the imagined by the masses as some prediction of the limitation of our senses in seeing the remainder of the magnetic spectrum of such futuristic wisdom about the invisible forces – rather he says that fish in the water cannot see the starts and so too we in this world it is like a cave being unable to see the true things of the heavenly world and if we do not want to reincarnate as fish, who are thus cursed to a worst station than ours, we have to do that heavenly will.

⁸³ Such a pitch of madness that is so harmful to humankind; accepting misery and leaving it for their children rather than taking actions to improve their own lives and of those who will come next – all for the sake of that imaginary podium where by following their mindless rites they will be crowned with immortality in some fantasy world devoid of suffering.

“μὴ σκοποῦντων ἡμῶν τὰ βλεπόμενα, ἀλλὰ τὰ μὴ βλεπόμενα· τὰ γὰρ βλεπόμενα πρόσκαιρα· τὰ δὲ μὴ βλεπόμενα αἰώνια.”

– *προς Κορινθίους Β'*, to Corinthians 2, IV: 18, where the Platonic plagiarism thus says to ‘fix their eyes on the unseem things, for the seen things are transitory, but the unseen eternal’.

“敬之敬之、天維顯思、命不易哉。
無曰高高在上、陟降厥士、日監在茲。
維予小子、不聰敬止。
日就月將、學有緝熙于光明。
佛時仔肩、示我顯德行。”

– 詩經: 頌 閔予小子 敬之, *Shijing*; Song Min Yu Xiao Zi Jing Zhi, where the Chinese converged to the same result; of some sadistic Heaven which ‘watches over all we do every day judging if we are good’ so that they waste their life in schizophrenia pleasing that imaginary being.

Thus it is that such ‘normalism’ has been so greatly selected for; not by being beneficial to any individual or the human species, by being beneficial to itself by providing sweet fantasies that so deceive the brain into spreading it further – and religions, which are a collection of such baseless guesswork, are the greatest example of that infectious mental illness that makes people sacrifice their life harming themselves and humankind for the sake of defending and disseminating that brain-deforming disease.

That was the Politeia; the government Plato elicited from his interpretation of morality and the world – a man who exceed the heroes in virtue and equalled the gods in power⁸⁴.

Likewise Qiu, often called ‘Confucius’, simply has as his philosophy following that which he deems to be ‘the old teachings’; philosophy being truly a political idea of how the best society is achieved, as he too following his sacred believes for absolutely no real purposed except for his imaginary aims – to which we can add most, nearly all, of all ‘philosophy’ or ‘politics’ recorded in the history of humankind, so entirely vain and worthless except as the perfect example of how awfully flawed such unscientific guesswork is if applied to the real world.

That is, the words of Ardeshir that ‘religion is the treasure and the king is merely the keeper of such’⁸⁵.

But rather it is the duty of philosophy to destroy the misconceptions formed from wrong ideas since all such great hope and expectation destroyed with such illusion would not be fulfilled either; the guesswork of ‘opinions’ without any consideration with the exact reality is a lost search in the dark where they are unable to reach their goals – while the truth saves them from the ill-directed effort since only scientific knowledge can reveal the path which has to be followed to arrive at some result.⁸⁶

⁸⁴ “Talis igitur ae de talibus Plato non solum heroum virtutibus praestitit, verum etiam aequiparavit divum potestatibus.”

– De Dogmate Platonis, The Doctrines of Plato, Librum I Caput II, which is indeed a fitting introduction to the most artful writer humankind ever had and to a man who dedicated his life following his ideals of rightousness and virtue.

⁸⁵ “فلما سمعت كلامه قالت: سمعاً وطاعة أيها الملك الباب الأول في السياسات الملكية وما ينبغي لولاة الأمور الشرعية وما يلزمهم من قبل الأخلاق المرضية أعلم أيها الملك أن مقاصد الخلق منتهية إلى الدين والدنيا لأنه لا يتوصل أحد إلى الدين إلا بالدنيا فإن الدنيا نعم الطريق إلى الآخرة لأن الله تعالى جعل الدنيا للعباد كزاد المسافر إلى تحصيل المراد فينبغي لكل إنسان أن يتناول منها بقدر ما يوصله إلى الله ولا يتبع في ذلك نفسه وهواه، ولو تناولوها الناس بالعدل لانقطعت الخصومات ولكنهم تناولونها بالجور ومتابعة الهوى فتسبب عن انهمالهم عليها الخصومات فاحتاجوا إلى سلطان لأجل أينصف بينهم ويضبط أمورهم ولولا ردع الملك الناس عن بعضهم لغلب قوتهم على ضعيفهم وقد أقل إزدشير: إن الدين والملك توأمان فالدين كنز والملك حارس وعلم أن أسباب المعيشة طلب الحياة والقصد من الحياة عبادة الله

فقال لي: قد بينه رسول الله ﷺ في قوله: الزاهد من لم ينس القبر والبلا وأثر ما يبقى على ما يفنى ولم يعد عداً من أيامه وعد نفسه في الموتى. وقيل: إن أبا ذر كان يقول: الفقير أحب إلي من الغنى والسقم أحب إلي من الصحة. فقال بعض السامعين: رحم الله أبا ذر أما أنا “فأقول: من أنكل على حسن الاختيار من الله تعالى رضي بالحالة التي اختارها الله له

– ألف ليلة وليلة: حكاية الملك عمر النعمان وولديه شركان وضوء المكان – A Thousand Nights And Night: The Tale Of King Omar And His Two Sons Sharkan And Al-Makan.

⁸⁶ “Und die Pflicht der Philosophie war: das Blendwerk, das aus Mißdeutung entsprang, aufzuheben, sollte auch noch soviel gepriesener und beliebter Wahn dabei zu nichte gehen.”

– Kritik der reinen Vernunft, Critic of Pure Logic, Preface I.

“So kann man immer überzeugt sein, daß ein solches Studium bei weitem noch nicht den sicheren Gang einer Wissenschaft eingeschlagen, sondern ein bloßes Herumtappen sei, und es ist schon ein Verdienst um

They mindlessly believe that ‘good deeds will expiate evil actions’⁸⁷ as if those unreal ‘good deeds’ of praying and humiliating themselves in hunder before their imaginary friend was able to fix any harm and evil caused; that ‘it is worthless to take precaution against destiny’⁸⁸ since god will provide what so ever he wills and we should simply be content with whatever we get – rather than tangible and real care and work towards a better future it is praised the highest psicological disorder of spending the entire night talking to their imaginary friend and the entire day reading the same text their whole life and when not reading it to repeat it outloud while not properly feeding or sleeping⁸⁹ since such pleasures of a healthy life is a distraction of that pain and misery necessary to receive the reward on the inexistent ‘next world’.

‘Every good thing that happens in life that does not get us closer to god then was truly a calamity as a few good things in this world distracts from many good things on the next and many things here make us forget entirely of the next’; so that ‘the happy man is he who serves god, and the foolish one he who gets distracted by having a good life here and losing the truly good world’ – which baseless ideas are all clearly for the pure detriment to the poor humans so infected with that mental illness rather than any benefit or good, as rather than building a better future they follow on ‘trusting our problems to god’ so that ‘god already decided when I will have bread to it and when I will escape or suffer calamities, thus it suffices to wait patiently and praise his name’ as ‘what is not to happen will not happen no matter how much we try and what is to happen will come even without seeking for it’.⁹⁰

die Vernunft, diesen Weg womöglich ausfindig zu machen, sollte auch manches als vergeblich aufgegeben werden müssen, was in dem ohne Überlegung vorher genommenen Zwecke enthalten war.”

- Kritik der reinen Vernunft, Critic of Pure Logic, Preface II.

”وقال بعض العارفين: فعل الحسنات بكفر السيئات“⁸⁷

- A Thousand Nights And Night: The Tale Of King Omar And His Two Sons Sharkan And Al-Makan, ألف ليلة وليلة: حكاية الملك عمر النعمان وولديه شركان وضوء المكان

”فإن يسر الله لي عيشتي وإلا قتعت بما قد رزق“⁸⁸

- Mil Noites e Noite, on the little tale about the fly and the rat. ألف ليلة وليلة -

وقال الربيع: كان الشافعي يختم القرآن في شهر رمضان سبعين مرة كل ذلك في الصلاة. وقال الشافعي “⁸⁹ رضي الله عنه: ما شبعنا من خبز الشعير عشر سنين لأن الشعب يقسي القلب ويزيل الفطنة ويجلب النوم ويضعف صاحبه عن القيام

- A Thousand Nights And Night: The Tale Of King Omar And His Two Sons Sharkan And Al-Makan, where thus is praised as the highest goal in life to be like such ‘holy man’ who spent his nights and days doing so while always fasting and avoiding sleep.

كل نعمة لا تقرب إلى الله فهي بلية وقليل الدنيا يشغل عن كثير الآخرة وكثيرها ينسبك قليلها“⁹⁰

؟وسئل أبو حازم: من أيسر الناس

؟فقال: رجل امضى عمره في طاعة الله، قال: فمن أحق الناس

Seduced by a future perfect beyond their imagination that they will not even have the trouble of building so that they say ‘I rejoice with death’; and although their current life is the height of all misery any will ever know, they are still threatened with eternal pain beyond their comprehension as if they do not obey ‘what awaits them is to burn in jahannam, going into the place of misery’⁹¹ – and so the disease not only inutilizes all the possible contributions that individual could make to society, but spreads on the harm to others be infected them or opposing those who will save the future as ‘the Jannat is under the shadow of blades’ doing the worse they can to humankind since ‘those who escape alive will receive gold, and those who die god will reward’⁹² although the denial of reality is boundless and it is ordered ‘do not say that the muhajins died since by falling in combat they are alive in some other place and we simply do not perceive that’⁹³.

This Politeia, and the others too, was a very awful place to consider living in and might seem like there is nothing at all about economy in all Plato said, yet I would say it is the most important one we have considered thus far; it is so clearly fanciful and distinct from the tangible good of society, and so detailed written and elicited from principles, that it furnishes us the most perfect example of what Normatism looks like – and that it is an illusion to think there is any more ‘economy’ in the modern Communism or that of Equality as there is in any religion or system of beliefs.

They are all different shades of that same disease; of pure guesswork appealing to paralogism and ‘feelings’ of their shared concept of ‘morality’ and ‘righteousness’ instead of any actual science and consideration of reality about what will produce real results⁹⁴ – the entire point of these two

”قال: رجل باع آخرته بدنيا غيره

– ألف ليلة وليلة: حكاية الملك عمر النعمان وولديه شركان وضوء المكان –
Tale Of King Omar And His Two Sons Sharkan And Al-Makan, the phrases in single quotes on this paragraph are quotes or paraphrase from this Islamic classic.

”جَهَنَّمَ يَصْلَوْنَهَا وَيُبْسِنُ الْقَرَارُ“⁹¹

– قرآن، XIV: 29.

”وقت إرضاء الكريم الغفار يا راجي النجاة في اليوم المخيف، إن الجنة تحت ظلال السيوف“⁹²

– ألف ليلة وليلة: حكاية الملك عمر النعمان وولديه شركان وضوء المكان –
Tale Of King Omar And His Two Sons Sharkan And Al-Makan, with this and the previous quoted lines.

”وَلَا تَقُولُوا لِمَنْ يُقْتَلُ فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ أَمْوَاتٌ بَلْ أَحْيَاءٌ وَلَكِنْ لَا تَشْعُرُونَ“⁹³

– قرآن، II: 154.

⁹¹ Thus too even books that touched on actual Economy are mostly worthless; as the Malthus terror soon mentioned in how it is impaired by his beliefs on some inescapable suffering and misery from the ‘laws of nature’, as the ‘proper christian commonwealth’ nonsense that takes most of the Leviathan of Hobbes or as the ‘invisible hand of morality’ that guides the beliefs of Adam.

last chapters have been to show that, and how utterly devoid of all sense is to even try to have any discussion about those unscientific systems that avert their eyes from reality as, even with the best of intentions and beautiful dogmas, they are simply incapable of freeing us from misery, but rather that mindless normatism increases it more even as they attempt otherwise⁹⁵.

You could expose all that harm of their policies with our current knowledge after a standard Economy course, but the reasoning to reject them would not be completely right; and why that is the case is what I will now show as we finally move into our modern proper and primitive science of Economy to show where it also fails in catching up to our scientific progress.

⁹⁵ “帝曰：余念其痛，心為之亂惑，反甚，其病，不可更代”

- 黃帝內經: 素問, Huang Di Nei Jing: Suwen, XXV: 2 or 寶命全形論, where thus the grand Yellow Emperor is said to complain that he is pained by thinking about the suffering of the people, but that it utterly confuses him how when he tries to do something about it their suffering rather increases as he is unable to heal their calamitous condition.

IV – Blind Plutus

What is ‘money’? And whence does the Wealth of Nations come?

For almost the entirety of our recorded history we see the ideas that ‘money’ is the same as ‘wealth’ with both being some precious metal; and it is easy to see why – as we considered grains or most other things spoil in little time so that a nation that has its necessities met exchange with others for things they want.

For that it is necessary that lasting storage of value in something.

With this countries have dedicated their extra resources at mining operations to get the maximum amount of the judged ‘precious metals’ that they could; that metal was equalized to wealth and what the nation depended on – the ban on selling gold or silver was even popular as a law on nations during the Mercantile Age when it was hardly established these beliefs that all their wealth came from having that metal.

That was some simple intuitive belief that lasted millennia and not much thought was given.

But then ‘Capitalism’ came; nothing more than the Science of Economy questioning those old ideas – asking ‘what is money?’.

The answer is rather simple, but the entanglement of preconceived beliefs made the discovery so hard; such, in fact, that although first germinating then a few centuries ago at the death of mercantilism I am here discussing on it to expose what ‘money’ and ‘wealth’ truly are.

So let us take two farmers; they produce some amount of goods and decide that it is to be divided equally between the two of them or perhaps based on how much they produced, but it does not matter – the point is that they make ten coins that represent their share of that total produce.

If both have five coins then they own half of that total produce.

What happens then if one farmer manufactures ten new coins so that he now has fifteen coins and the other has still his five coins? Is that ‘nation’ of two farmers any wealthier?

Since the total produce has now to be divided by twenty coins then it requires ten coins to be able to claim half of it; and thus the farmer with five coins, even though his nominal amount of money did not change, can now only claim one fourth of the total production.

That is the reason for that famous inflation that happens when the government ‘prints more money’; a country has a certain amount of goods, be then products or services, and a certain amount of currency which equals that entire production of the country – you divide that total

production by that amount of currency and can see what percentage of the total you own by how much units of currency you have.

If the government prints more money the ‘nation’, just like the farmers, do not get any ‘wealthier’, but that wealth is distributed as now the total production is divided by a larger number of currencies and your unchanged amount of currencies is therefore correspondent to a smaller percentage of that total production – you can buy less with it now.

Now the example of two farmers sounds very dumb; why do they not exchange directly or produce what they want? But of course reality is much broader and we have gone over the impossibility, and worthlessness, of that ‘self-sufficiency’; exchange being essential to any development of the arts and improvement in life.

Thus upon a shoemaker and a bricklayer wanting respectively an abode and something to wear on his feet, do they exchange one for the other? Or a pair of shoes for a single house? Or upon a medic needing aliment what should he do if the farmer does not need any treatment? All exchange is different and unequal when made thus in all variety of goods and services; it is necessary something that makes them somehow comparable – and so money was introduced by law-of-custom upon the owner and the distributed as the unit that measures all other things, however it is not the law that decides how many shoes correspond to a house or basket of food or any artificial form but what is truly just for such is the divisionary of two-equal-parts where all are the bisectator since if no one has any necessity or desire there is no reciprocity to there be exchange or value on the produced items and it is the demand that defines all price.⁹⁶

⁹⁶ “διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ὀνομάζεται δίκαιον, ὅτι δίχα ἐστίν, ὥσπερ ἂν εἴ τις εἴποι δίχαιον, καὶ ὁ δικαστὴς διχαστής. οἰκοδόμος ἐφ’ ᾧ α, σκυτοτόμος ἐφ’ ᾧ β, οἰκία ἐφ’ ᾧ γ, ὑπόδημα ἐφ’ ᾧ δ. δεῖ οὖν λαμβάνειν τὸν οἰκοδόμον παρὰ τοῦ σκυτοτόμου τὸ ἐκείνου ἔργον, καὶ αὐτὸν ἐκεῖνῳ μεταδιδόναι τὸ αὐτοῦ. ἔαν οὖν πρῶτον ἢ τὸ κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν ἴσον, εἴτα τὸ ἀντιπεπονθὸς γένηται, ἔσται τὸ λεγόμενον. εἰ δὲ μὴ, οὐκ ἴσον, οὐδὲ συμμένει: οὐθὲν γὰρ κωλύει κρεῖττον εἶναι τὸ θατέρου ἔργον ἢ τὸ θατέρου: δεῖ οὖν ταῦτα ἰσασθῆναι. ἐστὶ δὲ τοῦτο καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων τεχνῶν: ἀνηροῦντο γὰρ ἂν, εἰ μὴ ἐποίει τὸ ποιοῦν καὶ ὅσον καὶ οἶον, καὶ τὸ πᾶσιν ἔπασχε τοῦτο καὶ τοσοῦτον καὶ τοιοῦτον. οὐ γὰρ ἐκ δύο ἰατρῶν γίνεται κοινωνία, ἀλλ’ ἐξ ἱατροῦ καὶ γεωργοῦ, καὶ ὁλως ἑτέρων καὶ οὐκ ἴσων: ἀλλὰ τοὺτους δεῖ ἰσασθῆναι. διὸ πάντα συμβλητὰ δεῖ πως εἶναι, ὧν ἐστὶν ἀλλαγὴ. ἐφ’ ὃ τὸ νόμισμα ἐλήλυθε, καὶ γίνεται πως μέσον: πάντα γὰρ μετρεῖ, ὥστε καὶ τὴν ὑπεροχὴν καὶ τὴν ἔλλειπιν, πόσα ἅτα δὴ ὑποδήματ’ ἴσον οἰκία ἢ τροφή. δεῖ τοίνυν ὅπερ οἰκοδόμος πρὸς σκυτοτόμον, τοσαυτὰ ὑποδήματα πρὸς οἰκίαν ἢ τροφήν. εἰ γὰρ μὴ τοῦτο, οὐκ ἔσται ἀλλαγὴ οὐδὲ κοινωνία. τοῦτο δ’, εἰ μὴ ἴσα εἴη πως, οὐκ ἔσται. δεῖ ἄρα ἐνὶ τινὶ πάντα μετρεῖσθαι, ὥσπερ ἐλέγχῃ πρότερον. τοῦτο δ’ ἐστὶ τῇ μὲν ἀληθείᾳ ἡ χρεια, ἢ πάντα συνέχει: εἰ γὰρ μὴθὲν δέοιντο ἢ μὴ ὁμοίως, ἢ οὐκ ἔσται ἀλλαγὴ ἢ οὐχ ἡ αὕτη: οἶον δ’ ὑπάλλαγμα τῆς χρείας τὸ νόμισμα γέγονε κατὰ συνθήκην: καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τοῦνομα ἔχει νόμισμα, ὅτι οὐ φύσει ἀλλὰ νόμῳ ἐστὶ, καὶ ἐφ’ ἡμῖν μεταβαλεῖν καὶ ποιῆσαι ἄχρηστον. ἔσται δὴ ἀντιπεπονθός, ὅταν ἰσασθῇ, ὥστε ὅπερ γεωργὸς πρὸς σκυτοτόμον, τὸ ἔργον τὸ τοῦ σκυτοτόμου πρὸς τὸ τοῦ γεωργοῦ.”

– Ηθικά Νικομάχεια, Nikomachean Ethics, V, where amid his random list of virtues Aristotle lets out this

That is what ‘money’ is; and so much easier it is now to notice its nature as instead of precious metals we use symbolic pieces of paper and even easier in this transition to our digital currency where some virtual bits represent ‘money’ – thus how clearer than ever it is now that ‘money’ is nothing more than a token quantifying our share of that total production of the country and when we transfer it to the hand of another we are giving him that right upon that portion of the production⁹⁷.

Adam Smith had such insights and so noticed that merely increasing the amount of some metal and minting it into more coins would not increase the ‘wealth’ of the nation making it any more powerful; that only an increase in the actual production of goods would make it, and its citizens, truly wealthier.

The gold can be exchange for foreign goods into the nation, yes, but only if they want it and only by exchanging it away, not hoarding, does it have any use as ‘wealth’; and what is the use of the gold of a rich man against the arms of the bandit – or the wealth of a country full of gold everywhere if the citizens are dying in a famine?

The Wealth of Nations, then, comes not from metal or imaginary value, but truly ‘wealth’ means nothing more than ‘power’; only food provides the power to feed its citizens just as only arms provides safety once words and understanding fail to bring peace – wealth, then, comes from applying that metal and any other resource in the production of useful things that will increase the power of the nation.

A few decades later from that monumental work of Adam, which introduced the seeds of science into Economy and Politics, we have the frightening work of Malthus.

Observing the generosity of the king ingratiating the masses of the poor with alms he wondered about what was the actual economic effect of such social measures that distribute money.

What would happen if the daily alms was raised by five shillings?

That being just enough to buy a fillet of picanha rump steak will they then be able to have a decent meal with everyone eating picanha every day?

beautiful description of the rise of a standard currency in economy; to which I join him in his silly wordplays about the etymology of the Greek word for ‘money’.

⁹⁷ And what an infinite amount of stupidity that of Heinrich justifying ‘how paper that is easy to acquire can have value’ and his followers nowadays criticizing how ‘people enslave themselves working just to get a piece of paper’; what can only be wilful blindness intentionally not understanding even the simplest concept in Economy to instead focus on the physical material as if the value was the item itself rather than the value that the exchange token represents in acquiring any tangible item or service available in the general production of the State.

I asked that around to some people with absolutely no economic education and pleasantly they answer 'no'; whereat I asked 'why?' and they then naturally failed to provide an answer, although they could go as far as saying that 'they price would rise' and then if asked again why or how they would be stuck at the belief that 'it is complicated' – Malthus, however, could explain exactly how such apparent act of kindness in truth made life worse for the poor demographic⁹⁸.

By what we just said it is rather obvious; the effect of the competition between buyers that makes the price increase is the fact there is a limited amount of meat being produced and it has to be divided between more people than before – the meat will not magically multiply because they have some money now and it will be distributed to about the same number of people as before, but some who got it before now are deprived of it.

As on the example of the painter, and many others, the butchers has to determinate to whom he will sell it; to find some patent that is the most valid criterion for distribution – and that, of course, will be found in selling for those who pay most for it.

The best lands for production of cattle are expected to be already occupied, but now that meat, ergo cattle, are worth more now it becomes economic viable to use less efficient land to raise cattle or stop planting something else to raise cattle; that will increase the supply back to meet the demand, yes, but it will also decrease the supply of something else in that nation besides remaining at a higher price than before since before it was not worth to have that extra cattle.

There is the aspect of the 'social trap' being a huge discouragement for them to work and lose those free benefits so that they stay as an economic deficit consuming from the total produce without working to contribute to that production, but the workers themselves are harmed by that measure since the price of meat increase and while they could sometimes eat it before they now can rarely afford it; they would have to work eight hours to buy what they could with six while the longer that awful measure goes on the worst it gets for the entire population until he can no longer work so much and falls amid those who receive the benefit – ceasing to contribute to the production while simultaneously worsening his own situation and of all other even further.

In case I invite him to my house I can help him without worsening the situation of others except to myself and my family who might be able to endure it, since buying more meat would break the point, but the depth behind of 'teaching how to fish instead of giving the fish' is much deeper than what is interpreted of only dependence; because as we saw giving money worsen things to all, being altruistic worsens only the benefactors who tolerate such while if it is given some land or means of production then we benefit both him as the entire society.

⁹⁸ Exactly that example of an increasing in shillings at the price of meat on *An Essay on the Principle of Population*; and more extensively explained in *An Investigation of the Cause of the Present High Price of Provisions* about the contemporary event of prices growing over thrice their original value for grains, just as also for allied and competing goods of food.

It is not possible thus by means of donation to combat the 'poverty' of a class, that is for them to leave misery, because everything given to one depress all the others.

There is a limited number of goods and just giving him money without changing the production means that you gave him rights to a greater part of the goods of the country than before; what is impossible to happen without diminishing the part of all others – that is what happens when the prices increase and the money of everyone begins to be worth less.

As for giving the means of production he stops being a negative factor just consuming and generating misery to instead increase the common stock.

Thus if we take money from 'the rich' and give it to 'the poor' we will worsen the very situation of that entire demographic; not only 'printing money' creates inflation, but the redistribution of it does so too – it creates a localized inflation, with a spike in demand, on those products that the new owners, but not the old ones, will expend that money on.

Those products being the necessities for life then the entire poor demographic is thrown in much greater misery by that localized inflation because of that momentary donation to a few.

On a more personal measure there is the contentious action of giving alms to beggars; with the arguments that he will either spend it on booze or that giving encourages to there be more beggars while the opposite party simply claims a high moral ground that 'is the right thing to do' since they get off and feel good about doing it – when we can now clear see that those who give alms are injuring him together with all other poor demographic and workers as it is generating inflation right on what they necessitate to buy while if the beggar does use the alms to buy liquor it is actually the best he does to society for with this he actually mitigates the damage of the damned donator to society by having no effect since it did not allocated that to the competition for food increasing the demand there.

It seems irrelevant and insignificant to donate something to someone and that the effect is negligible while making that person happy or alleviating his suffering, however to say that is absolutely makes no difference giving to the poor is like those who say that throwing trash on the ground will make no difference; every process is composed of parts and it is not possible to alter any of them and say it is literally all the same when from the very initial conditions it is different – it is thus an unspeakable logical failure just because of the ignorance and neglect of the individual in studying that act to see its effect. Just as well seeing the collective culture of throwing trash produces all this unhappy state of before us; and so too those who support the beggars, the donation culture, accumulate such landfill dumps ever greater with more members accumulating their effect out of control become one of the great agents that cause the misery of the entire demographic – identical to throwing trash on the ground for an insignificant commodity and

زكاة

momentary relief, or by feeling saint in buying such cheap purification, they degrade the future of the rest of humankind.

Remember the weird vegetarian lion examples at the first chapter of this section; in how to reach the objective it required the exact science performing many actions rather than the worthless intuition of just shoving the fodder down the throat of the feline – and identically so if the goal is to help people to leave their misery it is only harmful that worthless intuition of alms, but it requires the exact study of Economy and many measures in others areas in order to affect promote them away from that situation.

As aforementioned the increase in the price of a single item will affect the entire economic scene since it is all part of a single system; the ‘competing goods’, as those that also require field and that require crops to feed and so on competing for the same resources, will also get dearer while allied products, as leather and collagen, might get cheaper – that restructure of the economy also leads to both certain specialties being worth more and other less, the employment of which can lead to more velocity of money through the economy and affect the rate of bank loans as it become more advantageous or not to invest.

And so on; modern economy has a very detailed picture of how each possible perturbation in the market affects all the rest – I entirely recommend doing a course if you wish to learn the current state where we model everything with a single wonderfully elegant tool of supply and demand, but this is as far as I will treat of it since with this exemplification of modern economic science I made my point so that I can forge on to where our current model falls short.

‘Capitalism’, the understanding of how value is produced and the immediate effects of each change in the factors of economy, is pure science; but laissez-faire is a mindless religious cult that emerged from it – although so old is the belief in the self-organizing and most-perfect ‘natural’ order of the universe.⁹⁹

No one has truly followed that anarchical savagery of testing out absolutely lawless laissez-faire, or at least not intentionally as we see nowadays some African countries that have fallen in that most calamitous state and look back in history to many other examples of the collapse of authority, but if truly applied it would manage to be even worse than the above Platonic communities; for they

⁹⁹ Adam with his ‘invisible hand’, as we can see on his worthless work on morals, was referring rather to such moral beliefs mixed with the most primitive views of supply and demand rather than our modern robust understand of such factors; only as we progressed in understanding ‘the economy of nature’ that we expanded the view of ‘selection’, where the hand is only invisible if we are blind, and without any explicitly development applied it to back to Economy producing our current one – but which application is thoroughly deficient in its magnitude as I show for the other natural sciences in Origin of Subatomic Species and as I will show now for Economy and Political Science.

are merely stuck on that idealized image of a past that has never existed, but anarchy is a continuous downward spiral of an ever worsening state until the reversion back to pure natural selection as mindless animals if it were to go on long enough – as the Dao leads to.

The free market does indeed organize itself as we just saw how it responds to perturbations of demand by changing both supply and price, but like all else it simply selects for the most fit strategy in its environment; and it is pure happenstance when that blind selection leads to human progress rather than the enslaving exploration of monopolies or the brain-rotting powers of religion – it is horribly typical in nature the indifference to death mingling rottenness with beauty, and perhaps loving the former more¹⁰⁰, so that such absolute savagery of nature is all that we aim to flee from in our society building endeavours.

Some cheeky meme is that ‘competition in theory’ has two chad entrepreneurs where one says ‘I produce higher quality goods than you for the same price’ and the other answers ‘Then I have no choice but to increase the quality of my goods’ while ‘competition in practice’ has two stereotypical owners of abusive companies where one says ‘See these identical cartons of milk? There used to be one litre, but now there is nine hundred millilitres for the same price’ and the other replies ‘Then I am going to dilute my milk with water’.

On the second chapter of the first section I went over how much that free selection of nature is blind in producing not only suboptimal results, but things that are directly unsustainable in the long term being harmful to all eventually, but for a more vivid example let us see that which made Robert question his believed architect of nature himself¹⁰¹.

¹⁰⁰ “Though it was horribly typical of the indifference of death in a nature which mingles rottenness with beauty, and perhaps loves the former more.”
– The Night Ocean.

¹⁰¹ “With respect to the theological view of the question; this is always painful to me.— I am bewildered.— I had no intention to write atheistically. But I own that I cannot see, as plainly as others do, & as I shd wish to do, evidence of design & beneficence on all sides of us. There seems to me too much misery in the world. I cannot persuade myself that a beneficent & omnipotent God would have designedly created the *Ichneumonidae* with the express intention of their feeding within the living bodies of caterpillars, or that a cat should play with mice. Not believing this, I see no necessity in the belief that the eye was expressly designed. On the other hand I cannot anyhow be contented to view this wonderful universe & especially the nature of man, & to conclude that everything is the result of brute force. I am inclined to look at everything as resulting from designed laws, with the details, whether good or bad, left to the working out of what we may call chance. Not that this notion at all satisfies me. I feel most deeply that the whole subject is too profound for the human intellect. A dog might as well speculate on the mind of Newton.— Let each man hope & believe what he can.—

Certainly I agree with you that my views are not at all necessarily atheistical. The lightning kills a man, whether a good one or bad one, owing to the excessively complex action of natural laws,—a child (who may turn out an idiot) is born by action of even more complex laws,—and I can see no reason, why a man, or other animal,

He was appalled at the behaviour of all animals in general, the parasitoid wasps of the Ichneumonidae being not truly special or uncommon, but as furnishing a beautiful introduction to the predatory ways of nature I will describe then here as based on his own observations of the behaviour of spiders during his circumnavigation of the globe.

“I observe an arachnid on the arched steel beam which coming out of the cement stand that serves as tresses to the high galvanized zipped roof tile; evilly on its perfidy being perfectly quiet ready to jump upon the poor foolish gecko which triggering the tripwires wanders near the sinister tunnel which is the fetid lair of silk.

The venomous fangs remain lustrously melanic even after so easily penetrating the stomach of the reptile; and making its soup the chelicerae move themselves independently one of the other leaving and entering the body of the animal where amid the white bubbles of foam forming on the open wound there is the red timbre of the blood mixed with the venom – it pulls the body to its house and after examining its powerless victim it delivers the last bite on the dorso-caudal proximal part, however although death could be so quick if the bite were fatal it instead bends its pedicel putting the venter of its abdomen together with the venter of the cephalothorax and revolving its prey before it weaves from its spinneret the silk coffin where the victim is preserved while the poison liquefy its body for it to be drank later for even if it is more brutish physically than a nephila or an epeira and more cumbersome on its ability of wrapping its prey it also does not give itself the crass trouble of ingesting solid food much preferring to watch its preys melting alive into juice first.

It drags the cocoon towards the others at the back of its house, however differently from a cocoon where a caterpillar melts itself to transform itself into its adult form the path of the victim is only one-wayed; as seen on the rat or small mammal there in the mortuary bodega which tail was not wrapped and how much more horrible was such creature squeaking and kicking the tetrapulmoned arthropod with its weak pinky legs being unable to leave while the false tarantula, a ‘wolf’ from the lycosae, dug into its body with brute force and venom until finally immobilizing it to the point where still alive it is no longer able to move – and although it would not have the same success if it decides to attack me much more noise and uproar I would make if such thing were to get near me, thus it is better for me to go away at once.

However I am stopped upon seeing dark death looming over us; just for a few moments I hear the buzzing of its flight before that in an instant the flight turns into a sudden rush of the wasp upon the spider – and as quickly as it attacked it flies away through the gymnasium.

may not have been aboriginally produced by other laws; & that all these laws may have been expressly designed by an omniscient Creator, who foresaw every future event & consequence. But the more I think the more bewildered I become; as indeed I have probably shown by this letter.”

– To Asa Gray 22 May [1860].

The spider is clearly wounded for it walks with difficulty and upon getting to the border of its level on the stand it falls rolling onto the next level; where people notice the creature so that with yells and jumps they get away from the arachnid which continues throwing itself through the stand until it gets to the ground level right on the side of the exit of the gym – through which it proceeds dragging itself to the turfs of grass and trash outside.

While I went to the roll-up door on the exit to watch such flight I hear the pepsis already returning; the ‘tarantula hawk’ wasp lands and walking in circles seems surprised or confused in not immediately finding its victim, but without delay it takes flight again with a different attitude – quickly vibrating its wings and antennae while making semicircles on the air like a laconian hound sniffing around for a fox.

The spider is well concealed, even so it is soon found out and rises its pedipalps and frontal pair of legs with its positioning following the enemy which evidently still fearing the fangs takes its time doing manoeuvres in the air; until seeing opportunities it comes down so repugnantly grabbing the dorsal thorax of the spider and contorting its own abdomen so that it stings the underside of the thorax of its target before fleeing and repeating the process until on the third time before attacking it examines the motionless spider with its antennae confirming its deed before beginning to drag the body – at which point I interfere and kill both the flying tyrant as its prey.

The arachnid, if it has any understand and knowledge, is thanking me from heavens for having taken its life; and not needing to watch the future spectacle before my eyes the mere terrible remembrance evokes every sentiment of repudiation and horror – even if against such hunting wasp its destiny would still be better than against some even more atrocious members of the apocritae.

The hunter would only drag the spider to its nest and bury it together with an egg so that paralyzed with the venom the arachnid would remain alive while the egg hatches and feed itself from the fresh non-vital parts of the paralyzed living creature to just at the end kill it; while a parasitoid one would already inject such larva directly into the body of its target which would not only be born inside of it eating it, but would infect the nervous system of the very spider so that it might build a web that protects them so that the larva may hatch to eat the spider slowly by the non-vital parts while protected by both spider and web – what is arguably better than the caterpillar which are infected with dozens of larvae at once and which babies have the audacity of eating only the non-vital parts so that they leave their host to form their cocoons since the infected caterpillar will do them not harm, but rather it will use its own silk to weave the remainder of their cocoons and defend such day and night until it itself dies from hunger little before the exiting of dozens of the same vile creatures from the cocoons where sisters and brothers will delight themselves in incest upon the cadaver of the host whom they partially ate and who gave its life for them before they go on then to infect more of such infantile butterfly which over half suffer such same fate.

Ergo I go out of my way to kill such and forfend the creation of a new generation, however it is vain for it is a too intelligent and successful strategy on the market of life; and thus before the free market without regulation it is explored ever so – as it is ubiquitously found around the globe the endless cycle of such highest cruelty upon a multitude of species.

The bizarre result of the free competition between the species where only the most perfidious creatures survive; although the world is still infested with those homo pseudo-sapiens too ignorant and stupid so that they say that some sickening author, ‘of love and benevolence’, intentionally created such immoral cruel villainy that is such ‘perfection’ of nature.”

That is one very successful strategy in nature; it is very fit and so it succeeds and is found to have convergently appeared all around the globe through both space and time – and even if we, driven by some insane morality or other reason, exterminate such creature others will eventually evolve to fill that successful niche again.

Now, what is the most fit strategy; to employ your energy in acquiring seed, tilling the land and all other aforementioned cares of a farm for months to then finally get a harvest to consume and sell – or to just sit back and relax all the while and when the farmer has collected his harvest to kill him and steal it?

It is clear how superior and advantageous the latter is; and that is what nature does in the endless revival of carnivourism as a speciation trait whenever it proves to be viable¹⁰² – and that is what we, artificially by law, forbid.

You might say that every possible writer agrees on that; ‘killing is wrong’ and ‘stealing is wrong’ – but see the entire point that I am not throwing some insane social norm and deified right of property, but I entirely justify it upon the most solid facts of reality as I am scientifically considering the results of such law and from that engineering the social environment that will select not for that great gain to some individuals but converge the most fit strategy with the general gain of the State.

Such pretty little dogmas, as ‘the right of property’, are much worse than useless; blinding its followers to Science it produces the same effects as the previous discussion of working towards the principle of ‘equality’ – and such others imaginary aims of moralism.

¹⁰² Some organisms turn carnivorous only momentarily; as the giant cannibals of the ciliate blepharisma or the plague-bringer locust both when exposed to a high population density – the beloved bamboo-eating bear which will proceed to eat its just-born baby if it happen to give birth to more than one is not an exact example of that carnivorous behaviour, but it, just like felines killing every baby of other males after taking over a pride, is an example of the undirected savagery of natural selection.

Equality is justice, but only between equals; inequality is also justice, but once again not between all but only between unequals – the products of a business made by two men is not divided half and half if one invested one man and the other the others ninety nine, or between he who worked for a month rising all the walls and roof and he who worked for one morning put one brick and one tile, for if such division half and half is not injustice, what is?¹⁰³

The State is not to benefit one or a few individuals over the common good; so that its justice proceeds from the equality between the proportion of their reward to their contribution to society.

So that when a country is well governed, poverty and disgrace are shameful; when it is ill, riches and honour.¹⁰⁴

Malthus, because of the Malthusian Horror of his philosophy you can see quickly described in Origin of Subatomic Species, concluded his work¹⁰⁵ just repeating the misguided line of Adam that ‘of all the ways in which a capital can be employed, agriculture is by far the most advantageous to the society’; or closer to his more insane line of ‘to cultivate the ground was the original destination of man’.

They focus on the same old ideas that ‘all wealth comes from working the land’; and there is that hyper-specialization disparate with it – when it is the progress of the arts, as more efficient ways to cultivate the land, that are infinitely more important than the momentary gains of spending the day tilling a field.

Progress accumulates exponentially; the invention of a motor and from it of farming machinery makes possible to few by themselves to produce in a year what in centuries the entire world dedicated to primitive farming would be unable to – yet, while they express their hope that

¹⁰³ “οἷον δοκεῖ ἶσον τὸ δίκαιον εἶναι, καὶ ἔστιν, ἀλλ’ οὐ πᾶσιν ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἴσοις· καὶ τὸ ἄνισον δοκεῖ δίκαιον εἶναι, καὶ γὰρ ἔστιν, ἀλλ’ οὐ πᾶσιν ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἀνίστοις· οἱ δὲ τοῦτ’ ἀφαιροῦσι, τὸ οἷς, καὶ κρίνουσι κακῶς.” – Πολιτικά, Politics, III, where he gives such definition of justice with those coins, and which I complement by changing ‘contribution’ from some moralist magic concept about effort or any other such useless ambiguity to the proper quantification of the results to society.

¹⁰⁴ “子曰：「篤信好學，守死善道。危邦不入，亂邦不居。天下有道則見，無道則隱。邦有道，貧且賤焉，恥也；邦無道，富且貴焉，恥也。」”
– 論語：泰伯, Lunyu: Tai Bo, XIII.

¹⁰⁵ Which greatest value of the work is his analysis into the causes of misery establishing the first robust ideas of unsustainability, which so greatly now plague our society; the critic that ‘he failed to foresee the industrial revolution’ is wholly meaningless as that increase in powers of production merely pushed a little higher those limits before catastrophes rain down on us – where his failure, and the true horror of his philosophy, is in assuming that those limits and boundaries are ‘fixed laws of nature’ that his god put upon humankind so that we have to helpless accept it and pray for a life without suffering on the imaginary ‘next world’ rather than something we can do something about with our efforts and intellect to improve our conditions in life.

‘science will continue to evolve’, they place to value in what is the most important thing to invest on as the greatest means to increase the production of wealth. ‘True wealth’ as Power and not simply a pile of metal or a large quantity of products, but allowing convenience, health and quality of life to improve as impossible even to the richest kings of a less advanced civilization.

To exemplify let us degrade their argument to a popular phrase common to the idealized masculinity of today that says ‘strong men make times easy, easy times make weak men, weak men make times hard, hard times make strong men’, but although so unworthy of any mention and dissertation, merely showing off their ignorance of all history and logic, it does provides us with a good starting example; where we can see the strongest and most disciplined men in Classical Greece and on the Roman Republic fighting quite often with the same certainty of death as in Thermopylae and enduring hopeless times such as Cannae while besieged cities often would rather suffer the horror of murdering their women and children before going to die themselves in battle than to leave them as rewards for the victors to do what they pleased upon them – but how far from easy such times eternally were with not a hint of improvement much less of that cyclical supposition of amelioration and degradation, although at that time they of course already spew such nonsense as that comfortable couches or tasty food or adornment to their clothes and houses, or any culture and ethnicity distinct from theirs, made men weak.

And so most awful times remained for the millennia of recorded History until quite recent times when rather than ‘hardening men’ to be insensible to pain we treat those causes of suffering themselves; since no matter how ‘strong’ a man is he is entirely powerless to help even alleviate his mother, wife or children as they suffering lay dying sick in from of theirs eyes how much less to cure them, but which with knowledge a ‘weak man’ can apply a remedy or perform a surgery saving them as all the strength of every men in the world together could not even after millennia with hundreds of generations of ‘strong men’ everywhere do nothing but watch helplessly until they were saved from their miserable condition by the intellect of others – as we already seen on specialization ten thousand strong men are replaced by a single machine¹⁰⁰ while today even

¹⁰⁰ “ὁ δ’ εἶπε “Κλέοβιν τε καὶ Βίτωνα. τοῦτοισι γὰρ εὐοῖσι γένος Ἀργεῖοισι βίος τε ἀρκέων ὑπὴν, καὶ πρὸς τοῦτω ῥώμῃ σώματος τοιῆδε· ἀεθλοφόροι τε ἀμφοτέροι ὁμοίως ἦσαν, καὶ δὴ καὶ λέγεται ὁδε ὁ λόγος. εὐοῖσιν ὀρτῇ τῇ Ἥρῃ τοῖσι Ἀργεῖοισι ἔδεε πάντως τὴν μητέρα αὐτῶν ζεῦγεί κομισθῆναι ἐς τὸ ἱόν, οἱ δέ σφι βόες ἐκ τοῦ ἀγροῦ οὐ παρεγίνοντο ἐν ὥρῃ· ἐκκληγιόμενοι δὲ τῇ ὥρῃ οἱ νεηνία ὑποδύντες αὐτοὶ ὑπὸ τὴν ζεύγλιν εἰκον τὴν ἀμαξάν, ἐπὶ τῆς ἀμάξης δέ σφι ὥχετο ἡ μήτηρ· σταδίου δὲ πέντε καὶ τεσσαράκοντα διακομίσαντες ἀπίκοντο ἐς τὸ ἱόν. ταῦτα δέ σφι ποιήσας καὶ ὀφθεῖσι ὑπὸ τῆς πανηγύριος τελευτῇ τοῦ βίου ἀρίστη ἐπεγένετο, διέδεξέ τε ἐν τοῦτοισι ὁ θεὸς ὡς ἄμεινον εἴη ἀνθρώπῳ τεθνάναι μᾶλλον ἢ ζῶειν. Ἀργεῖοι μὲν γὰρ περιστάντες ἐμακάριζον τῶν νεηνιέων τὴν ῥώμην, αἱ δὲ Ἀργεῖαι τὴν μητέρα αὐτῶν, οἷον τέκνων ἐκύρῃσεν· ἡ δὲ μήτηρ περιχαρὴς εὐοῖσα τῷ τε ἔργῳ καὶ τῇ φήμῃ, στάσα ἀντίον τοῦ ἀγάλματος εὐχετο Κλέοβιν τε καὶ Βίτωνι τοῖσι εὐωτῇς τέκνοισι, οἳ μιν ἐτίμησαν μεγάλως, τὴν θεὸν δοῦναι τὸ ἀνθρώπῳ τυχεῖν ἀριστον ἐστί. μετὰ ταύτην δὲ τὴν εὐχὴν ὡς ἔθυσάν τε καὶ εὐωχήθησαν, κατακοιμηθέντες ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ ἱρῷ οἱ νεηνία οὐκέτι ἀνέστησαν ἄλλ’ ἐν τέλει τοῦτω ἔσχοντο. Ἀργεῖοι δὲ σφῶν εἰκόνας ποιησάμενοι ἀνέθεσαν ἐς Δελφούς ὡς ἀριστῶν γενομένων.”

– Ιστορίαι, Histories, I: 31, in which the very father of History so praises two men for the defeat of, when not finding oxen, pulling the cart themselves with their mother to the festivities; and so as admirable and

millions of the hardest, strongest and most idealized soldiers even in war are useless as a single bomb can get rid of them all at once with the bomb not only redefining every future conflict since but if the third Reich, or any other nation, had directed its resources at being the first to develop the bomb then they would have won the war, but even more important than that extreme superior efficiency in production is that case of the cure since the ‘strong men’, or hardworking farmers, will starve together with their families at any pestilence, bad weather or plague as all they can do is uselessly pray for the in-existent help of their imaginary gods and so on in all aspects of life where only the improvement and progress of the knowledge in understanding the world to find not only better ways to do it but ways to do it at all, Power, is what will beget any benefit to humankind.

praiseworthy their ‘laudable happy death’ as after they went to sleep and their rest was prolonged forever since they woke up no more.

“Omnis homines, qui sese student praestare ceteris animalibus, summa ope niti decet, ne vitam silentio transeant veluti pecora, quae natura prona atque ventri oboedientia finxit. Sed nostra omnis vis in animo et corpore sita est: animi imperio, corporis servitio magis utimur; alterum nobis cum dis, alterum cum beluis commune est. Quo mihi rectius videtur ingeni quam virium opibus gloriam quaerere et, quoniam vita ipsa, qua fruimur, brevis est, memoriam nostri quam maxime longam efficere. Nam divitiarum et formae gloria fluxa atque fragilis est, virtus clara aeternaque habetur.”

- De Catilinae Coniuratione, About the Conspiracy of Catilina, I: I, on which introduction so beautifully puts Sallustius that riches and beauty are fleeting and fragile while virtue, from the intellect, is shines bright and lasts eternal; contrasting ‘that which we have in common with the Gods’, our intellect, and ‘that with beasts’, that the works of the body so that any who wishes to leave a legacy will employ of his intellect rather than brute strength during his brief life.

With five megacalories, over twice the daily energy intake of an average man, at the sad efficiency of our biological machinery, only a fourth or fifth going into work, one strong man could perhaps do the unbelievable feat of with a paddle strike and stir one kilolitre of water until his energy was thoroughly spent and he managed to raise the temperature of the water by one degree; what an amazing effort and feat which very few humans in all of history would be able to accomplish, if at all as the heat should dissipate much faster than he can increase it – yet, of course, with very little intellect any man can achieve results infinitely more impressive and more useful as by gathering wood or any other fuel he can boil it all with little effort and little calories of his own spent. And more than that current effect of its usefulness it compounds on as we leave not only the direct benefit to our children, but that knowledge which they can work upon expanding it further so that they may attain things that are not possible to achieve in our own time.

How happy then the collective intellects which brought about mechanical motors so that instead of being condemned to the servile occupations of our awful biomachinery we can just burn fuel to plow the land, waive clothes and any other necessity our ingenuity set itself to acquire; how happy that if we lack oxen we need not to pull the cart with our necks under the yoke – the same intellect which here testify to us that meaningless feats of bodily strength is far from praiseworthy, but the despicable misery we aim to abolish.

“σοφὸν βούλευμα τὰς πολλὰς χεῖρας νικᾷ”

- Ιστορίαι Πολυβίου, Histories from Polybius, I, where he attributes to Euripides the phrase that ‘a wise plan beats many hands’; which he uses when showing how the brain of one man defeated a host of enemy so great that they were certain it would be impossible to avoid destruction at the hands of that enemy.

While little merit is founding in trashing that silly baseless popular phrase, we attain some benefits in exercising the art of reasoning; which we can apply then back to the idealized farmers above of an agriculturic-centric economy – that just as the strong men are meaningless and useless in the grand picture of humankind so too is that farming or any other production, which last but one season, whereas only intellectual contributions can both last and improve the situation of mankind forever as no 'hard-work' can do even for the momentary instant it lasts.

And so too how constructing an environment that selects for that, for progress, is the only investment that will produce results increasing the Power of the State.

For let us suppose the owner of a field who on the time of the harvest hire people to gather it; how much should he pay to those he hired at dawn, at midday and to those who came right before dusk with just a few minutes of work?

One denarium to each regardless?

The mere idea of working all day long and receiving the same as a person who worked half a day or just a few minutes is revolting to most people; and as we saw it is not simple envy at the felicity of others, but that such unjust 'generosity' of the owner does indeed devalue their work generating inflation to that poor class begetting then nothing but misery – and although these economist might stutter at this scenario it seems impossible they could truly agree with such worthless model.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁷ “ὁμοία γάρ ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ἀνθρώπῳ οἰκοδεσπότη, ὅστις ἐξῆλθεν ἅμα πρωὶ μισθώσασθαι ἐργάτας εἰς τὸν ἀμπελῶνα αὐτοῦ. συμφωνήσας δὲ μετὰ τῶν ἐργατῶν ἐκ δηναρίου τὴν ἡμέραν, ἀπέστειλεν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸν ἀμπελῶνα αὐτοῦ. καὶ ἐξελθὼν περὶ τὴν τρίτην ὥραν, εἶδεν ἄλλους ἐστῶτας ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ ἄργους· καὶ αὐτοῖς εἶπεν, Ὑπάγετε καὶ ὑμεῖς εἰς τὸν ἀμπελῶνα, καὶ ὁ ἐὰν ἡ δίκαιον δώσω ὑμῖν. οἱ δὲ ἀπήλθον. πάλιν ἐξελθὼν περὶ ἕκτην καὶ ἑννάτην ὥραν, ἐποίησεν ὡσαύτως. περὶ δὲ τὴν ἑνδεκάτην ὥραν ἐξελθὼν, εὗρεν ἄλλους ἐστῶτας ἄργους, καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Τί ὥδε ἐστήκατε ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν ἄργοι; λέγουσιν αὐτῷ, Ὅτι οὐδεὶς ἡμᾶς ἐμισθώσατο. λέγει αὐτοῖς, Ὑπάγετε καὶ ὑμεῖς εἰς τὸν ἀμπελῶνα, καὶ ὁ ἐὰν ἡ δίκαιον λήψεσθε. ὁψίας δὲ γενομένης λέγει ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος τῷ ἐπιτρόπῳ αὐτοῦ, Κάλεσον τοὺς ἐργάτας, καὶ ἀπόδος αὐτοῖς τὸν μισθόν, ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τῶν ἐσχάτων ἕως τῶν πρώτων. καὶ ἐλθόντες οἱ περὶ τὴν ἑνδεκάτην ὥραν ἔλαβον ἀνὰ δηνάριον. ἐλθόντες δὲ οἱ πρώτοι ἐνόμισαν ὅτι πλεῖονα λήψονται· καὶ ἔλαβον καὶ αὐτοὶ ἀνὰ δηνάριον. λαβόντες δὲ ἐγόγγυζον κατὰ τοῦ οἰκοδεσπότη, λέγοντες ὅτι Οὗτοι οἱ ἔσχατοι μίαν ὥραν ἐποίησαν, καὶ ἴσους ἡμῖν αὐτοὺς ἐποίησας, τοῖς βασιτάσας τὸ βάρος τῆς ἡμέρας καὶ τὸν καύσωνα. ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν ἐν αὐτῶν, Ἐταῖρε, οὐκ ἀδικῶ σε· οὐχὶ δηναρίου συνεφώνησάς μοι; ἄρρον τὸ σὸν καὶ ὑπάγε· θέλω δὲ τοῦτῳ τῷ ἐσχατῷ δοῦναι ὥς καὶ σοί. ἡ οὐκ ἐξεστὶ μοι ποιῆσαι ὁ θέλω ἐν τοῖς ἐμοῖς; εἰ ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου πονηρός ἐστιν, ὅτι ἐγὼ ἀγαθός εἰμι; οὕτως ἔσονται οἱ ἔσχατοι πρώτοι, καὶ οἱ πρώτοι ἔσχατοι· πολλοὶ γάρ εἰσι κλητοί, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί.”

– κατὰ Ματθαῖον, from Matthews, XX: 1-16, the ‘parable of the farmer’.

While that harmful dream of receiving gifts and ultimate rewards by no merit of his own simply because ‘he suffered something’ by not being amongst the rich so that ‘the rich have to be humiliated and the poor exalted’

But that ‘should’ for us is far from any worthless norm of ‘right’ or ‘wrong’, but simply the results of each action; for us it instead sounds like ‘what is the result of such a model?’ and then ‘is that final outcome desirable?’.

On the first unthinkable model of all receiving the same we know about that generating misery rather than helping that class, but further we have that the optimal strategy is to come at the latest possible so that he will get the most reward per time spent; it will be crippling to production and under such a policy the country would die of hunger with the crops rotting uncut on the field.

The usual idea of ‘justice’ that those who worked all day should receive about double of those who worked half a day and so on is certainly much better, but it being proportional to time does not correlates with any ‘work’ or ‘effort’ they put in; what about those who arrive early, but stay all day loitering around the field without doing work? Or if those who worked hard early are tired and their performance go down greatly while those fresh ones work half a day with much strength? And then the reality mentioned that ‘effort’ or ‘intention’ is whole meaningless¹⁰⁸; no one

is clearly a worthless mentality to any endeavour or economy; and one very common on the imaginary justice of some authors who converged to such populist line to win over the masses.

“valet ima summis
mutare et insignem attenuat deus
obscura promens; hinc apicem rapax:
Fortuna cum stridore acuto
sustulit, hic posuisse gaudet”

- Carmina I: XXXIV, 12-16, as Horatius whence the christians likely copied.

“謙：亨，君子有終。

謙，亨，天道下濟而光明，地道卑而上行。天道虧盈而益謙，地道變盈而流謙，鬼神害盈而福謙，人惡惡盈而好謙。謙尊而光，卑而不可踰，君子之終也。

地中有山，謙；君子以裒多益寡，稱物平施。”

- 易經: ䷎ 謙，Yi Jing: Qian, I, and on the other side of the world the same idea.

“يا ولدي عليك بجميل الصبر يعظم الله لك الأجر فإن الأجر على قدر المشقة”¹⁰⁹

- A Thousand Nights And Night: The Tale Of King Omar And His Two Sons Sharkan And Al-Makan, where the sister religion to the one above goes on the worthless view mentioned that ‘the reward is proportional to the effort’; although in this case the sickening fanaticism goes through the roof as he is actually talking about living a life of suffering and odium so that they might be rewarded in proportion on the imaginary other world.

“يا خائنًا في ظلام الله والهلكة..... أقصر عنك فليس الرزق بالحركة”

The Thousand Nights And Night: The Tale Of The Fisherman And The Ifrit, where it says then that effort does not lead to success as after so much effort pulling the fishing net all he got was the accursed vase; although nothing can really be praised on this damned culture and as later said it is the even worse belief then that ‘fate belongs to god and no one can win to trap it or release it; neither studying nor skill can bring good luck’.

pay for such ambiguous imaginary parameters, but by the results produced – so that we have there our answer.

They ‘should’ be paid by the impartial analyses of how much each contributed; how much he repeated, what the distance carried – ‘should’ because that makes the optimal strategy to be producing actual results and contributing so that the most advantageous to society is selected for.

How ‘worthy’ then of wealth he who invent gathering machines and more efficient ways of working leading to many folds the production; and how for the State then rather than having all working nonstop on fields and hyper-specialized jobs for their immediate production to be a little lower for the sake of nurturing those scientist who will generate exponential gains for all future of humankind!

They go thus against the very ‘free-market’ they supposedly advocate for; Malthus goes on about how some jobs are good for society while other service generate a lot of gain to the individual alone without generating also the benefit to society, but in his blindness he merely says that the government has to somehow restrict the market to direct that gain to the production of food – while Adam goes harder on his twisted belief saying that singers and ‘such professions’ gain well because of ‘the difficulty to endure the public prostitution and shame’ so that once that profession loses that stigma they will no longer gain so much, and so on creating unnecessary divisions for no reason but his beliefs of what is a worthy job to have.

And while they were thus having fun with their norms they just scratched the nature of Economy still supporting such ignorant beliefs as the laissez-faire, with their little exceptions to it, that would not work even if all agents were rational and prescient; for it is not a March of Progress between a good and bad allocation of resources, but a web of niches where the symbiosis of cartels, the exploration of the public goods, the slavery to monopsonies and the violent carnivorous revolt of the masses taking back what was private property are only the inevitable optimal strategies which will naturally arise in response to the environment – the only function and duty of the government is to interfere with such, and not in providing services, since the uncontrolled quasi-invisible hand has no purpose nor goal so that it leads to progress as to loss as to stagnation, but only the intentional interference is able to turn such labour directional leading to some objective by selecting what is desirable and beneficial to society.

For if we are to judge only which producer of grapes presents the greater harvest before us one of them will easily win by at night set afire the vineyard of his neighbour; thus he wins the

“لا طريق إلى الدين والدنيا أسهل وأقرب من طريق العلم فإني أعطيت هذا المال العظيم في مسألتين أو ثلاث،”

– ألف ليلة وليلة: حكاية هارون الرشيد مع جعفر والجارية والإمام أبي يوسف – A Thousand Nights And Night: The Tale Of Harun Al-Rashid With Jaafar, The Slaveress And Imam Abi Yusuf, where a much better idea is presented almost worthy of the name House of Wisdom as it says that there is no shorter or easier path than knowledge for the things in this world and the next; although the actual content of the tale is worthless with the shameless of religious abusing loophole in their own laws to get what they want and ‘be technically not infringing the law’.

competition as the best, but the result is obviously less than optimal to the whole society – so that there are laws which impeded him from adopting such strategy on the market, as it would be allowed in a truly free market where they ‘let it be’ and not even the proponents of such admit such liberty for they ignore such assuming implicitly the restrictions and laws preconceived on their mind as they were absolute science, and are required ten thousand more restrictions in order to guide the result of the competition to the desired benefit of society.

A man trained in fighting or simply with a knife or weapon easily kills a business man and in seconds acquire the wealth built in decades; thus his strategy is genial to the extreme and one which nature has shown to be divinely successful with the carnivores – but obviously it is absolutely worthless to society and ubiquily forbidden by law is such acephalous natural savagery of the true *laissez-faire* for it is of no value for the government, except by a happy accident, their competition for the individual good of each but rather he who contributes more to society.

On the same way to sell food without the sanitation standards is forbidden; and we saw the absolute outrage of the entire city to the poor rural people bringing their cheese and eggs to sell on the fair and the inspectors throwing everything on the ground ending the fair because they did not have the due regularization to such items – they do not have the liberty to sell even if there are those who want to buy, just as too is forbidden the sale of poison and many other substances, since that liberty is detrimental to the general good of all in the State.

Taxes have to be collected from somewhere; should it be on every item equality then by their value? Rather it is beyond insane that basic food items and what is considered as a necessity of the people have any tax as if it were something to be discouraged; if there is any desire for all to have then it has to be stimulated with the due externalities of something profitable to society while the taxes can come only from the non-essential that is acquired then not by necessity, but delight, so that the due priority of things is established¹⁰⁹ – this acts upon the cause of the suffering and misery in contrast with taxing impartially as if generating more economic movement were something to be punished or the sickening social dependencies that cause only evil to themselves instead of good or any attempt of equality to the smallest common denominator creating then general necessity.

But they only give some trifling mentions about food being unable to elicit such direct inference from their own words; that there should be no tax in necessity but on luxury – of not taking in accordance with the gain of each as if contributing to production should be punished by making him pay more than who did little, but in accordance with the effects of his services to the judged good to society.

¹⁰⁹ Visualize that famous example of a jar with large stones where the teacher asks if it is full and it is answered it is, but then he proceeds to fill it with many pebbles and ask again before filling with sand and ask to then finally fill with water; which if then put out of order it would not fit and the priority is ‘for the most important things first’.

Taking taxes from food diminishes misery, but then taking the taxes from jet skis and dirigibles only weakens the power of the government¹¹⁰; the worthless regulation of price also based solely on the item without considering the usage, as if all were employed to equal purposes, is one of the greatest agents of the misery of society.

As how water costs the same be it for the survivor of the individual or to waste in hectares of useless grass lawns¹¹¹; on the same way it is a cruel joke to treat the consume of electricity and gains of laboratories preserving medicines or households on their basic necessity on the same way that the sick people who build the most powerful computing tools just to consume energy in useless iterations guessing an answer as ‘proof of work’¹¹² – and how clear it show of how inefficient and dysfunctional is the system of decentralized power while how shameful to the equally worse-than-useless current government on their qualification of governing anything.

Only the apex of foolishness, and inefficiency, as are such populist governments of democracy could make something like selling a limited resources, as fossil fuels, indiscriminate without any criteria; and then upon having incredible inflation during crises to burn the money of the government to buy-out the people covering for such failed industry to the entire population instead of the obvious choice of cutting such useless expenses to keep functional the truly necessary services of logistics¹¹³ – for the demonized petroleum and combustibles are like guns and they do not kill any person nor destroy the environment, but who uses them has the entirety of the blame.

Even a leader of state who seeks environmental reforms and closes up petroleum wells still will increase the production and extraction if there is a war; as it is the obvious reality that cutting up the energy supply of the other is the most basic strategy and it is infinitely better to use such

¹¹⁰ It sounds like an exaggeration and a joke, but it is a real ridiculous measure passed in Brazil recently.

¹¹¹ Common question of contention in the United States which have such lawn culture and an ever-growing water problem.

¹¹² That is, the common method used for cryptocurrencies.

¹¹³ As during the recent pandemic and at the outbreak of wars; depending on indulging the masses the government, even if it wanted, is unable to control its people and save the precious resource only for the most valuable industry – or to properly charge them for all the destruction caused by the virtually useless massive consumption.

Underground oil itself is a resource belonging to the State and na absolute detrimento to society to allow some random farm owner to get rich because there was oil on ‘his’ property; today the cost for the people is that cost of extracting it from under the ground and some little gain they have, and while I mention the externality of the pollution and damage it causes from its usage there is also that ignored cost of extraction that is the depletion of the nation reserves of a finite resource – who utterly absurd then to sell it for merely the extraction price, and that the gains go to some random worthless individual rather than to the State who truly owns it and who is both losing that finite resource at gathering as suffering the harms of the pollution of its usage!

It is a policy which weakens the Power of the State, and thus worsens the life of its inhabitants both on the present as for the future generations, rather than a sound policy which increases its Power improving the State.

combustible than for the cornered countries to go down into a nuclear war¹¹⁴ – just like such combustible can be used to power-up plans that save and restore the environment several magnitudes more than the burning of it causes, but the problem is that it is not being used like that for without any criteria it is given for the masses to burn up as it pleases them without them even paying for the external damages and problems that they causes for much on the contrary the countries are controlled by such reckless will of the masses and even destroy their own future closing nuclear power-plants by baseless believes and fear of that which they are ignorant about¹¹⁵.

The ecologic crisis and almost every existent problem, for even natural disasters and diseases cause so much damage only by the negligence of preparing against such, are not because of ‘fossil fuels’ or any such factor, but the free market as it so well is convenient for such worthless un-governments of populists elected by the ignorant majority; virtually everything is caused by the simple and pure lack of regulation – the masses, like the free market and natural selection, have no prescience and if our model is to imitate cancers in competing for resources with each other for the self-interest of each individual, without the regulation of the central command of the body making all cooperate to a single mutual objective, then the single organism called Society and State cannot survive.

And so is the current state where without the rational guide of science to make them plan goals it is a body where the endocrine and nervous systems are dysfunctional; we see a world where the brain, heart and kidney compete against the feet and fingers for resources because ‘all have the same rights and is unfair for any organ to take priority’.

For the actual system requires the blind tax to all so that they use without really paying for the harm they cause; while those who bring benefits with their good use instead of being rewarded have to pay the same taxes too!

The most ridiculous tragedy; it has been created the system where it is impossible to elect something who will threaten thus to require the masses to pay for what they consume – there exists no different between ‘tax’ or ‘externality’ or ‘salary’, but they are the exact same controls to

¹¹⁴ The new government of the United States was trying to mitigate the awful effects of the previous leader and was going to close the new wells, but at the outbreak of the war it decided to cancel the cancellation plans; to which environmentalists so foolishly and ignorantly of anything complained against that necessary evil.

¹¹⁵ The so contentious decisions of Germany burning its filthy coals and closing its Nuclear power; a crime against their own future and the well-being of the rest of the world – based on pure superstition and spread of the intolerance of ignorance, with the coal being worse even at releasing radioactive heavy metals into nature how much more at all the diseases and problem of pollution.

Quite akin how the above environmentalists complain about ‘the rich’ using their jets while the masses are struggling with paper straw and such measures; when eliminating ‘the rich’ entirely would not change at all our situation since that higher consume of a few is many orders of magnitude inferior to the real problem that is the mass consume of the masses.

be exerted requiring the entire value that is due by those who consume something and paying for all the service done for the sake of society.

Another violence of the ‘free market’ by that very United States known as the proponent of it was the ban of microchips to China; ignoring their own slogans by threat of war – as what State in its sane mind would defend a policy that strengthens its enemy and is detrimental to itself?

Adam would approve of that measure and he explicitly mentions war as one of such ‘exception’ to his mystical belief in the invisible hand, but a Rule does not have an ‘exception’; instead the existence of a case where the Rule fails shows that the normative ‘right of property’, or freedom of trade or what so ever else, is a mere fiction of their whim and one that is as far from science as it is detrimental to the State – rather it leads us to seek the true underlying of conducting economy that could explain both cases, which is my point here in saying that it is by such restrictions in selecting for what is best for the State so that it will actually lead up the road we want.

Such are not exception of the ‘principle of freedom’ but the obvious application that the only criterion is the contribution to society¹¹⁶; the positive ones receiving their gain in proportion and the negative ones having to deal with the consequences and prohibitions – the difference is that they conceived those laws against direct murder and theft from their obvious necessity to the functioning of society, but on the same way guided by moralist guesswork they have no idea what they are doing since their instinct naturally lacks the due economic science to differentiate between good laws and those worse than worthless one produced by their religious prejudice which most often serve the opposite purpose spending resources only to cause unnecessary suffering worsening the life of their own people rather than making the State and living there better.

Not for any particular individual and much less for the imaginary aims of moralistic norms.

As forbidding prostitution and the medical assistance to abort which merely forces them to do it illegally in a much worse situation so that the reason for the law is simply that the fools in power decided on their imagination that others having the legal choice bothers them; with no what so ever thought about the results that it will continue on happening while allowing so would only bring benefits to the wellbeing of the population – and if it could truly be stopped to happen, what

¹¹⁶ “The same tendency to simplify and generalize, produces a still greater disinclination to allow of modifications, limitations, and exceptions to any rule or proposition, than to admit the operation of more causes than one. Nothing indeed is so unsatisfactory, and gives so unscientific and unmasterly an air to a proposition as to be obliged to make admissions of this kind.”

– Principles of Political Science, on which he follows saying that sadly there are things he can see no other way since he sees the overwhelming application of some ‘principle’ on almost every thing except for those few exceptions; but as I said, that was pure blindness and rather he should have looked for the broader principle which rules and justify both seemingly different choices at the different cases.

advantage do they imagine there to be in forcing the population thus to raise another being that they do not even want? And how much less of a pseudo-argument there is against prostitution; openly going against that professed ‘freedom’ and ‘right of property’ over one’s body simply because they do not like it – no what so ever even excuse to the effects or purpose of that policy in making the world better! Not any less ridiculous is how the war on drugs tries to combat an actual and real evil to society¹¹⁷, but it is done so poorly and mindlessly that it merely makes things infinitely worse; even science is forbidden from progressing and bringing a better life to both all in the advancement of medicine and in special to those chained by addiction, yet ‘drugs’ are seen as malign satanic substance being against the law for a scientist to study or research the plant to learn all its possible uses in treating diseases or stopping its ill effect on others – what advantage could any argue to instead of treating the problem with a deep analysis to instead banish it from any human eye as a cursed plant forbidden to be seen?

But I stray too far from economy with these, being led by the normalism of laissez-faire which pure guesswork upon the notion of ‘right to property’ does not differ in nothing from the unscientific meaningless of Platonic governments treated on the preceding chapter.

The usage of gold in jewellery and in medical electronics are of values infinitely different to society; and it is not possible nor sane to treat the usage of such finite resource on the same manner and that they ‘compete freely’ for it when the costs to society are whole different – nor is there any benefit from allowing it to occur in absolute disorder without any plan on the non-directional market, only selecting itself in circles with no purpose, and even worse that they use the public goods with impunity without really paying for what they use.

The sacred deified right to private property is not the right to be a injurious disease to society causing damage to the State with impunity at his discretion; much the contrary ‘right’ to property means also that he has duties to render to the government who keeps those rights – and those who fail on their duties have no right to reclaim.

Every law is made for the good of the State and not the contrary of the State being submissive to laws as if they were a sacred inviolable code instead of just some arbitrary foolishness that a random group of men who did not even knew each other thought of their own imagination and prejudices to be beautiful codes of conduct; and if such law ceases fulfilling its purpose and

¹¹⁷ Not a smaller evil is that of ‘Tiktok’ or any such networks; the consternation caused by the restriction of personal freedom due to banning it is indeed a factor to consider, but many times over ten thousand times greater is the harm incurred to the entire State by allowing such a plague to the production and efficiency of society to run free – silly videos with the outliers who harm themselves physically due to acéphalous trends are an inconsiderable and meaningless evil when factored in the grand picture of what we have to consider when taking the decisions of what, and how, to prohibit and allow certain behaviours.

And of course, in the special case of this specific program, it is just laughable the absolute incompetence of the government that allows that spyware to spread in broad day light all over their country; a harm and dangers so much greater than the aforementioned ban in selling microchips and weapons to a competing State.

instead it is harmful to the State it has to be promptly discarded – so that it is beyond absurd for them to spend their resources defending what is a general loss to society which only responsibility of the State is to instead nurture it.

I do talk of the extreme case of revoke the property of others, as it was necessary to truly end with the slavery of the colonized South America, but rather than ‘special circumstances’ and ‘exceptions’ it is done upon the most basic economy principle which defines and gives sense to all the rest.

Let us take the most basic tax that people pay on all property and piece of land, since everything truly belongs to the State and it is merely lent to such private ‘owner’, and ask ourselves what mental incoherent can lead one to charge the same tax from one who uses his property to produce and contribute to the economy as to what has to be charged of one who uses his right of property to keep it inactive, because he wants a too expensive rent or any other reason, or even as a hindrance to society; how beyond all logic and reasonability is it when one citizen refuses to leave his house or land when it is necessary to building of a road or any other facilities of the government there – so that we have those infuriating examples of a road forking around such houses who refused even large sums of money.

The land truly belongs to the State and is lent to him by the government who also defends his right over it with all its power; how can be supposed that the State is meant to protect those rights of being a disease to society and spend its resources defending something that is detrimental to itself? Rather than offering large sums of money it is shameful¹¹⁸ for the State to not promptly declare the public execution at such attempt against the well-being of the common wealth; he would have to bear the cost of all the damage he is causing to Society in all that extra work around, the longer and more dangerous path taken by everyone who uses that road and so on with astronomical taxes for the rent of that plot of land – and all ‘right’ as the protection granted him are null at the same instant he refuses his duties of being a benefit, not a weight and deficit, to the State.

Simply it is the price of the public good which he decides to consume and the externality of his actions which he owns to society.

Different persons upon renting some equal land with a private person they expect to pay the same price; which is based on the size, location and any natural advantage as its soil or a river – where they think it strange if the owner ask ‘what are you going to do on my land?’ when the ludicrously ridiculous is the contrary of not asking.

¹¹⁸ This sounds rather moralistic, but the repetition is killing me; by seeing the entire argument there can be no doubt that what I am saying is not some guesswork and norm, but truly that a ‘shameful action’ or that it ‘has to’ means that it will result in undesired results rather than the improvement of the State and condition of life.

Who rents can use the land in agriculture and improve even further the soil or then destroy the biota with chemicals; or he can directly make a refinery of metals or cleaning products just as using it as a dumping ground for those – all following uses which would cause extensive damage upon the soil and make the property worthless to almost all other usage. Or renting some building when we consider the different of the one who reforms it and the one who in neglect or intentionally destroys it.

Or were not thus exempt of part of the rent if they wanted to raise poultry?¹¹⁹ For such great fertilizers would improve the quality of the soil; while it just follows that who plants chestnuts, which infertilize all around, or every other harmful practice of monocultural plantation or cattle just as its begotten destruction and pollution have to entirely pay for such caused damage – the usage is the factor that determinates the price of rent, and even if one rents and does nothing with a good plot of land which could be producing and serving the market he is already causing damage to be repaid to society.

And that, more than obviously, makes a great different for the owner of the property; indeed the usage of such is not-rarely what should be the most important factor on the price of renting – and the true owner of all is the State.

There is no what so ever sense in it being some aside tax or for the owner to have to go in suing such person because of damage to the property after the deed being done, but that just as one cannot open an uranium refinery or other radioactive products without the whole regularization of dealing with all cost to mitigate the damage to the environment to zero they have also to regularize all usage and service so that they do not come to steal from the public or private goods and so that they can be selected to what is most advantageous to the public interest.

On the same way there is a rent, and housing, crisis going on for many years now; even on small towns a big company can just buy land in mass and set their own artificial prices on their monopoly – or not sell it at all, but force all to rent at them if they want to stay in town, which is what the collective mass of landlords are doing too.

Those are very good strategies in a free market; what is ridiculous is the government who not only allows it, but protect their rights against the well-being of the rest of society.

So too for the abusive ‘capitalistic’ entrepreneur of the eighteen and nineteen century with the gigantic factories; as said Heinrich was completely wrong and drowning in his own stupidity when

¹¹⁹ “Ego arbitror praestare ex aviariis turdorum ac merularum, quod non solum ad agrum utile, sed etiam ad cibum ita bubus ac subus, ut fiant pingues. Itaque qui aviaria conducunt, si cavet dominus stercus ut in fundo maneat, minoris conducunt, quam ii quibus id accedit.”

– Rerum Rusticarum de Agri Cultura, About the Things of Cultivating the Field, II: XXXVIII.

he came up with conspiracies theories of the 'bourgeoisie' in order to so enslave the 'working class' forever as it was merely the extreme over supply of labour that took the price of that good down to meet the short demand – yet it was indeed the lack of a sound government that caused for the hellish iron mills to led at such height of suffering and that was not only by defending the abuse and failing to provide alternatives itself, but by passing worse than worthless regulations as minimum wages, safety standards and prohibiting child labour which have simply forced people who truly needed a job to survive to seek out illegal and even worse conditions.

Many of those were won by the workers themselves protesting, but on their stupidity they only worsened their own situation; those requirements and standards were also used by the British as a competition tool in order to keep the Indian economy behind its own – and the minimum wage might be the worst of all as it is still in vigour.

On an economy course you will see that a minimum wage can sometimes create an optimal production better than the natural convergence of supply and demand of a free market¹²⁰, but that deceitful information is often presented just like that without explicitly saying how that changes non-stop and needs to be adjusted both up and down just as it is hand-craft specially for that single product and thing in question; a general minimum wage for the entire economy being an absolute plague both to production as to small companies and people who need any unskilled job to survive¹²¹ – it causes not only the waste of much of the power of the State in being so inefficient in its production, but rather than mitigate suffering it exacerbates it greatly exactly to that poorer and most needed demographic of society. And so too pretty sounding holier-than-thou projects akin to the trend of 'ethically sourced coffee' are a nightmare to many poorer countries; it is not

¹²⁰ That is, the owner of some business can find twelve people to work for him by offering wages of seven hundred money units; each worker he hires produces the equivalent of one thousand money units during that time, will he then hire five more workers with wages of eight hundred? He makes one thousand per worker so that seems like a no-brainer, however in order to do that he would have to raise the wages of all his workers to that new standard; increasing the wage of those twenty workers by one hundred would already cost two thousand, plus the five new wages of eight hundred, so that he would be losing from his profit by hiring more, even thought he still could do so! Thus if we have a minimum wage of nine hundred it would not matter to him to hire one more person; he would hire the most he can since they are going at that fixed proportion rather than balancing the price of labour for what is most profitable to him – thus we would increase production by taking from his profit, which is of course the goal and not to 'distribute the money' merely for the sake of cutting his profit.

¹²¹ On the above example we have the simple point that if that minimum wage was not at nine hundred, but at one thousand or more, it would simply be impossible for that company to hire anyone since that would not bring any profit; while if that wage was too low he would rather increase the wage at his own discretion in order to find that best maximized profit point – and as the peaks and troughs of the economy, and of that very sector of business changing by seasons, roll on that value of the minimum wage has to be adjusted up and down to match that desired maximization of profit.

So how detrimental to put those minimum wages mindlessly and equal to every sector; ignoring all benefit that could be gotten from it maximizing production, but rather bankrupting some while forcing most microenterprises into illegality, as it is the case everywhere here in the small town I live in, since they simply cannot afford to comply to the law if they want to keep their business open, or if unskilled and other workers with special daily journeys want to be hired – as on Everybody Hates Chris III: 8 where he demands minimum wage to then learns that, even if one can be legal without going bankrupt, complying to the stupid regulations of an unintelligent government is worse both to himself as to his employer.

possible to force European ideas of minimum age and living standard in those places so that rather than magically converting all those workers from ‘enslaved labour’ to their idea of ‘proper conditions’ they simply bankrupt the owner of the plantation on that region and force those unskilled people to much worse conditions in mining ores or whatever else they can find to keep themselves alive while their former jobs is meaninglessly moved up to more skilled people.

Requirements are necessary for jobs, but by having requirements for a surgeon we stop people from becoming surgeons and end up with less surgeons than we would have; and so more people die by not having access to surgery in time – what happens then if we remove those requirements of proving those skills? We have more surgeons in business and the price of treatment even declines; but then the number of people who die by having a poorly performed surgery shoots through the roof and we are found in a much worse situation than before – thus it is beneficial for the State to have that barrier for entry and rather than any ‘quotas’ favouring people of different ethnicity or any other arbitrary stupidity to have them judged strictly on ability, otherwise the supposed good of that individual will be a harm to the rest of society.

What skills are then needed to pick up some colourful red berries against the high-contrast green background? The requirements in this case, as in the mindless general minimum wage, simply prevents the most unskilled, those who need it most, from actually finding a job since at the price of that requirement the entrepreneur will have to prefer some more skilled one who is then wasting his skills in such job instead of contributing more to society; it is a storm of deficits whose benefit is simply imaginary to the mass of people who feel like saints forcing their standards upon others without even caring to see the result of their actions – that is, like the Platonic government in last chapter they are laws produced purely by their imagination rather than any knowledge or science in attaining some real goal.

Adam calls of fool and presumptions those who dare to think themselves more able and sufficient than chance and accident, however directly after he becomes that insidious crafty animal vulgarly called statesmen or politic for he lists then cases where the freedom of the market is indeed better for society in case it is restricted; the aforementioned random ‘exceptions’ that he found pleasing to add without properly eliciting the principle behind the validity of all such cases – taking on the guise of the apology of Socrates or the teachings of Qiu¹²² he repeats that ‘Dias takes away half of

¹²² “子貢曰：「如有博施於民而能濟眾，何如？可謂仁乎？」子曰：「何事於仁，必也聖乎！堯舜其猶病諸！夫仁者，己欲立而立人，己欲達而達人。能近取譬，可謂仁之方也已。」”

– 論語：雍也, Lunyu: Yong Ye, XXX.

“子曰：「君子成人之美，不成人之惡。小人反是。」”

– 論語：顏淵, Lunyu: Yan Yuan, XXI.

Where, like always, Qiu says in all his shallowness with no elaboration or application, but which Socrates beautifully goes on in his judgement of how he cannot be intentionally making the citizens bad since by having bad company he would only hurt himself seeking his own harm.

eh excellence of those forced into servitude'¹²³ in criticizing how inefficient slavery is and even worse on the more cruel ones as the Iberians so that the destructive colonialism is directly opposed to the prosperity they seek which would be achieved by cultivating rich allies and partners, yet so lost he wanders curbing the professed freedom all around when slavery is optimal to that master and it is the predatory behaviour that inevitably appear time after time if allowed the savagery of free nature to run its course rather than the proper remedy to this evil which is to engineer the environment to instead select what is good for the State.

'Let-it-be'!? To trust to chance something so grandiose and so noble is very outrageous!¹²⁴

Plutus will remain blind and far from us will always be his cornucopia if the Sciences, our sacred Panakeia, do not grant him sight¹²⁵.

For a picture of what the anarchy of a truly free market let us take a look at the only philosophy who truly advocates for it explicitly; where it is taught that we have to abandon all knowledge since by looking only at ourselves is that we will find the true Path - with never leaving our house, looking into the detail of things or distracting our minds thinking about them we will acquire the perfect understanding of them by being inert and allowing for everything to happen naturally without interfering with the perfect natural Path¹²⁶.

Thus following that belief they teach about a perfect former state of humankind where there were no tools or tricks in work since those things are unnatural artificialities produced by men; nor any medicine or trying to avoid death since that too is natural nor to use ships, carriages or weapons,

¹²³ “οὐκέτ' ἔπειτ' ἐθέλουσιν ἐναίσιμα ἐργάζεσθαι·
ἡμῖν γάρ τ' ἀρετῆς ἀποαίνονται εὐρύοπα Ζεὺς
ἄνερως, εὖτ' ἂν μιν κατὰ δούλιον ἥμαρ ἔλῃσιν.”
- Οδύσσεια, Odyssey, XVII: 321-323.

¹²⁴ “τὸ δὲ μέγιστον καὶ κάλλιστον ἐπιτρέψαι τύχῃ λίαν πλημμελὲς ἂν εἴη.”
- Ηθικά Νικομάχεια, Nikomachean Ethics, I.

¹²⁵ The wonderful imagery of the god of wealth being blind; since both just and unjust men get rich indiscriminately instead of a due reward and blessing from the gods - on which beautiful play of Aristophanes it is Panakeia, 'the cure to all diseases' and which it is truly our Sciences, who heals his sight, as only this Science I now present in engineering the social environment will provide that prescient selection for that which will attain our aims rather than the savage blindness and savagery of blind natural selection advocated by the free market.

¹²⁶ “不出戶知天下；不闚牖見天道。其出彌遠，其知彌少。是以聖人不行而知，不見而名，不為而成。為學日益，為道日損。損之又損，以至於無為。無為而無不為。取天下常以無事，及其有事，不足
以取天下。”

- 道德經, Dao De Jing, XLVII-XLVIII.

but to cease the invention of writing to instead record things using strings – doing that, depriving themselves of all art and invention, they will be free from all inequality that those craft create which lead to thieves, lying politicians, return to their former blissful state where every food will taste sweet, every clothe pretty, every house good and nothing more than their very simplicity will provide them infinite pleasure and entertaining¹²⁷.

People under governments have suffered from famines and poverty thus it is argued that laws clearly have to be the source of all such crises and suffering; ergo without any law everything will be perfect since then everything will be natural and ‘nature is perfect’ – that is their black-and-white world and the depth of their thoughts.

Even more is promised then; since nature is thus perfect those who follow that Path with no skill or knowledge simply looking inside them will be one with nature being also perfect as the best farmers possible since nothing they perform will fail to produce nor will anything they do ever go wrong and so there will be vigour in everything they attempt and their families will accumulate riches in abundance to all sides – even when they come and go anywhere they will not need to fear buffalos, tigers or any enemy as their horns, claws or weapons will not be able to do harm to his body and death will never touch them as long as they are one with the Path¹²⁸.

¹²⁷ “小國寡民。使有什伯之器而不用；使民重死而不遠徙。雖有舟輿，無所乘之，雖有甲兵，無所陳之。使民復結繩而用之，甘其食，美其服，安其居，樂其俗。鄰國相望，雞犬之聲相聞，民至老死，不相往來。

以正治國，以奇用兵，以無事取天下。吾何以知其然哉？以此：天下多忌諱，而民彌貧；民多利器，國家滋昏；人多伎巧，奇物滋起；法令滋彰，盜賊多有。故聖人云：我無為，而民自化；我好靜，而民自正；我無事，而民自富；我無欲，而民自樸。

民之飢，以其上食稅之多，是以飢。民之難治，以其上之有為，是以難治。民之輕死，以其求生之厚，是以輕死。夫唯無以生為者，是賢於貴生。

勇於敢則殺，勇於不敢則活。此兩者，或利或害。天之所惡，孰知其故？是以聖人猶難之。天之道，不爭而善勝，不言而善應，不召而自來，繹然而善謀。天網恢恢，疎而不失。”

- 道德經, Dao De Jing, LXXX, LVII, LXXV, LXXIII.

¹²⁸ “善建不拔，善抱者不脫，子孫以祭祀不輟。修之於身，其德乃真；修之於家，其德乃餘；修之於鄉，其德乃長；修之於國，其德乃豐；修之於天下，其德乃普。故以身觀身，以家觀家，以鄉觀鄉，以國觀國，以天下觀天下。吾何以知天下然哉？以此。

出生入死。生之徒，十有三；死之徒，十有三；人之生，動之死地，十有三。夫何故？以其生，生之厚。蓋聞善攝生者，陸行不遇兕虎，入軍不被甲兵；兕無所投其角，虎無所措其爪，兵無所容其刃。夫何故？以其無死地。”

- 道德經, Dao De Jing, LIV, L.

It is hard to not interpolate here in the obvious result where they will be eviscerated by all such dangers while they do nothing watching their families in the worst of miseries, but let us just go on.

The great example to imitate is to be like Lie who on his absolute simplicity behaved as if his body was just a lump of dirt¹²⁹; since if one has no knowledge of what is harmful or not he will live perfectly following the Path devoid of any thoughts¹³⁰ – since ‘knowledge is infinite and human life finite, thus it is vain to seek to increase in knowledge’¹³¹ so that by following the Path he will instead ignore this earthly reality to as an spiritual being not need any knowledge of what is poisonous or an agent or disease nor what is useful for plants or any craft as even the heat of boiling lakes nor the cold of being frozen in a lake will affect him.

The best way to govern, thus, is to do nothing since ‘he who does nothing is the master of all wisdom as he fulfils what Heavens ordains by not interfering with anything, being a mirror which nothing conduces or anticipates and so he has success in all things and harms no one’¹³²; and so the saint or wise does no commerce nor learn any craft or art since the wise makes no plans but simply depends on Heaven so that knowledge is worthless to him as the Heaven provides all he needs whereas thusly all tools and materials are meaningless since such instincts will only make him act and all action is contrary to the perfect inert nature of the Path¹³³ – and that is undoubtedly true since ‘the wise does not occupies himself with the world; he does not seek what is profitable nor tries to avoid what is harmful so that he has no pleasure in gaining nor suffers by losing. He

¹²⁹ “然後列子自以為未始學而歸，三年不出。為其妻爨，食豕如食人。於事無與親，彫琢復朴，塊然獨以其形立。紛而封哉，一以是終。”

– 莊子：應帝王, Zhuangzi: Ying Di Wang, V.

¹³⁰ “齧缺曰：「子不知利害，則至人固不知利害乎？」王倪曰：「至人神矣：大澤焚而不能熱，河、漢沍而不能寒，疾雷破山、風振海而不能驚。若然者，乘雲氣，騎日月，而遊乎四海之外。死生無變於己，而況利害之端乎！」”

– 莊子：齊物論, Zhuangzi: Qi Wu Lin, XI.

¹³¹ “吾生也有涯，而知也无涯。以有涯隨无涯，殆已；已而為知者，殆而已矣。為善无近名，為惡无近刑。緣督以為經，可以保身，可以全生，可以養親，可以盡年。”

– 莊子：養生主, Zhuangzi: Yangsheng Zhu, I, which so sickening claim is the perfect opposite to the noble dedication to sciences where ‘life is brief, but art macrouis’ in dedicating oneself to leave a better world; as Hippocrates in the beginning of Ἀφορισμοί, Aphorisms, and which his wonderful wisdom can be found properly praised on my On the Origin of Subatomic Species.

¹³² “無為名尸，無為謀府，無為事任，無為知主。體盡無窮，而遊無朕，盡其所受於天，而無見得，亦虛而已。至人之用心若鏡，不將不迎，應而不藏，故能勝物而不傷。”

– 莊子：應帝王, Zhuangzi: Ying Di Wang, VI.

¹³³ “聖人不謀，惡用知？不斲，惡用膠？無喪，惡用德？不貨，惡用商？四者，天鬻也。天鬻者，天食也。”

– 莊子：德充符, Zhuangzi: De Chongfu, V.

talks without talking and as he talks he does not talk. He is happy with dirt and dust. How is it known that the love to live is not an illusion? And the fear of death the ignorance of a youth who does not know the right path?¹³⁴.

That is the government of the perfect age that the introduction of virtue and arts have destroyed; the time when people just followed their nature and both wove their clothes as tilled their ground for food as their common occupation – not separating into classes, but just following their natural tendencies. They would walk slowly with no hurry and look only ahead with no anxiety of their surroundings; there were no roads nor any tunnel, no boats to cross lakes nor dams to block their natural path, all creatures lived with each other with their nests all near – all birds and beasts spread abundantly as endless flocks and herds while the grass and trees were all lush and large. We could lead any bird or beast without any apprehension or difficulty nor would birds flee as we peered into their nest; all men lived in common with all animals and so all creatures were equal as one single family – there was no distinction between virtuous and base men. The equality of all having no knowledge so that they never went against their natural inclinations; free of all desired in the state of Primordial Simplicity – only on this state people are what they are meant to be.

It was the arrival of virtuous men preaching about benevolence and righteousness that universally perplexed the mind of the people; their show of music and the ritual of their ceremonies started to separate man and destroy their equality – the raw materials of nature do not form vases unless violence is done cutting them and only broken jades fit their cups so that men lost the true Path by following the teachings of benevolence and righteousness. The abandonment of the natural instincts was what led to such ceremonies, new colours and art apart the five colours, new chords

¹³⁴ “瞿鵲子問乎長梧子曰：「吾聞諸夫子，聖人不從事於務，不就利，不違害，不喜求，不緣道，无謂有謂，有謂无謂，而遊乎塵垢之外。夫子以為孟浪之言，而我以為妙道之行也。吾子以為奚若？」長梧子曰：「是黃帝之所聽熒也，而丘也何足以知之！且女亦大早計，見卵而求時夜，見彈而求鴉炙。予嘗為女妄言之，女以妄聽之，奚？旁日月，挾宇宙，為其脗合，置其滑濫，以隸相尊。眾人役役，聖人愚芑，參萬歲而一成純。萬物盡然，而以是相蘊。予惡乎知說生之非惑邪！予惡乎知惡死之非弱喪而不知歸者邪！麗之姬，艾封人之子也。晉國之始得之也，涕泣沾襟；及其至於王所，與王同筐床，食芻粢，而後悔其泣也。予惡乎知夫死者不悔其始之蘄生乎！」

– 莊子：齊物論, Zhuangzi: Qi Wu Lin, XII, and read on as it goes on with this most intellectual disgusting of all human ideas, but what I have paraphrased of this is enough to show how it is hammered in the idea of ignoring all feeling and real harm of self-inflicted mutilation by brainwashing the listener that the pain is not real; and that at the point he becomes insensible to everything he will attain the perfect world with only happiness. The western reader might find it all very strange and meaningless as some curiosity, but this disease is almost as large as the western disease of christianity; with over a billion followers today and for two millennia have been so cursing that poor region to this depth of self-inflicted misery.

and instruments apart from the five notes; just as the skilled craftsmen injured the materials of nature to fit their forms the virtuous men have injured the true nature for their virtue.¹³⁵

Thus if we are having much difficulty and doing very little progress in digging a channel we must beware if someone comes and teach us how to use the wood as a lever to be able to lift heavy things with the application of little strength; since we know that where there are such tricks there are thoughts behind them and the kind of people who have those hidden thoughts in their hearts come to lose their Primordial Simplicity so that their spirit gets agitated losing the Path so that that invention is shameful.¹³⁶

¹³⁵ “吾意善治天下者不然。彼民有常性，織而衣，耕而食，是謂同德；一而不黨，命曰天放。故至德之世，其行填填，其視顛顛。當是時也，山無蹊隧，澤無舟梁；萬物群生，連屬其鄉；禽獸成群，草木遂長。是故禽獸可係羈而遊，鳥鵲之巢可攀援而闌。夫至德之世，同與禽獸居，族與萬物並，惡乎知君子小人哉！同乎無知，其德不離；同乎無欲，是謂素樸。素樸而民性得矣。及至聖人，斲鑿為仁，踳跂為義，而天下始疑矣；澶漫為樂，摘僻為禮，而天下始分矣。故純樸不殘，孰為犧尊！白玉不毀，孰為珪璋！道德不廢，安取仁義！性情不離，安用禮樂！五色不亂，孰為文采！五聲不亂，孰應六律！夫殘樸以為器，工匠之罪也；毀道德以為仁義，聖人之過也。”

- 莊子：馬蹄, Zhuangzi: Mati, II, where most clearly is described that fantasy world of the age of Primordial Simplicity; and which absolute misery if we were to revert to that mental state of insapience devoid of all arts being below of the quadrumata does not require explanation here.

“歧伯對曰：往古人居禽獸之間，動作以避寒，陰居以避暑，內無眷慕之累，外無伸官之形，此恬憺之世，邪不能深入也。故毒藥不能治其內，鍼石不能治其外，故可移精祝由而已。”

- 黃帝內經：素問, Huang Di Nei Jing: Suwen, XIII: 1 or 移精變氣論, where the infinitely more respectable classic of ‘medicine’ so describes that same fantastic past; on the twelve chapter, or 異法方宜論, it describes how the mechanisms of yin and yang behave in different heights, winds, seasons and temperatures leading to different diseases and thus the five different methods of medicine were create to properly treat each of those sources, but then there on the thirtieth it goes on how back on that time of Primordial Simplicity they lived among animal following the proper behaviours of the seasons so that no evil qi could disturb their peaceful interior making thus drugs improper for their insides and surgery improper for their outsides since by merely regulating their qi they would treat any illness before it caused any harm.

¹³⁶ “子貢南遊於楚，反於晉，過漢陰，見一丈人方將為圃畦，鑿隧而入井，抱甕而出灌，搢搢然用力甚多而見功寡。子貢曰：「有械於此，一日浸百畦，用力甚寡而見功多，夫子不欲乎？」為圃者叩而視之曰：「奈何？」曰：「鑿木為機，後重前輕，挈水若抽，數如沚湯，其名為槩。」為圃者忿然作色而笑曰：「吾聞之吾師：『有機械者必有機事，有機事者必有機心。』機心存於胸中，則純白不備；純白不備，則神生不定；神生不定者，道之所不載也。吾非不知，羞而不為也。」子貢瞞然慙，俯而不對。”

- 莊子：天地, Zhuangzi: Tiandi, XI, where this situation is described with an old man working on a field digging the channel; and at the end after his discourse of how such ‘tricks’ of knowledge are shameful the other guy goes away in shame with his head down being unable to even give an answer to the untouchable justice of the old man.

Rather it is because of such tricks that there are bad things in the world and if all wise man are killed there will no longer be any thieves or evil in the world; since it was the wise who invented measuring weights and contracts, but it is not through those things that man use forgery to lie and to steal?¹³⁷

If such things are destroyed men will return to Primordial Simplicity with no longer any means to lie or steal; by teaching benevolence the wise also make people see what is evil – and if benevolence just cease to exist then they will follow their natural instinct and evil will no longer exist either.

If iron had never been discovered and the knowledge of smithing never been invented then no one would make swords and thus there would be no war or killing; with no sciences of knowledge and with no laws there would be perfect order and peace – with no thoughts or planning we would have the perfect organization we had before in the age of Primordial Simplicity.¹³⁷

The superior man thus keeps his five organs inactive; he does not use his sight nor his hearing so that being still he seems to be dead – but it is like so that his presence of a dragon is seen and while in silence he resounds like thunder and his movements are alike that of spirits with all heavenly things following him. Thus with no preoccupations to his mind and doing nothing his influence attracts and brings to him all things so that nothing needs to be done to properly govern the world.¹³⁸

For our bodies to last forever we need to follow the Path; and the Path is dark and hidden in silence so that one must be sightless, deaf and devoid of all feelings since with the guidance of the spirit the body will be corrected – so that with the eyes seeing nothing and the ears hearing nothing the hear will not know anything and thus the spirit will maintain and fill the body making it live for a long time as one distances himself from everything external.¹³⁹

¹³⁷ “故曰：「脣竭則齒寒，魯酒薄而邯鄲圍，聖人生而大盜起。」掊擊聖人，縱舍盜賊，而天下始治矣。夫川竭而谷虛，丘夷而淵實。聖人已死，則大盜不起，天下平而無故矣。聖人不死，大盜不止。雖重聖人而治天下，則是重利盜跖也。為之斗斛以量之，則並與斗斛而竊之；為之權衡以稱之，則並與權衡而竊之；為之符璽以信之，則並與符璽而竊之；為之仁義以矯之，則並與仁義而竊之。何以知其然邪？彼竊鉤者誅，竊國者為諸侯，諸侯之門，而仁義存焉，則是非竊仁義聖知邪？”

– 莊子：胠篋, Zhuangzi: Qu Qie, II.

¹³⁸ “故君子苟能無解其五藏，無擢其聰明，尸居而龍見，淵默而雷聲，神動而天隨，從容無為而萬物炊累焉。吾又何暇治天下哉！”

– 莊子：在宥, Zhuangzi: Zai You, I.

¹³⁹ “再拜稽首而問曰：「聞吾子達於至道，敢問治身奈何而可以長久？」廣成子蹶然而起，曰：「善哉問乎！來！吾語女至道。至道之精，窈窈冥冥；至道之極，昏昏默默。無視無聽，抱神以靜，形將自正。必靜必清，無勞女形，無搖女精，乃可以長生。目無所見，耳無所聞，心無所知，女神將

To solve any problem we need only to transform ourselves; if we ignore our body and throw away the power of hearing and the power of sight forgetting all things we will then free our spirit – and devoid of a living soul we will be like the primordial chaos¹⁰⁰ – if we are devoid of all knowledge and sensations to perform things without thinking then the instinct of nature will guide us through the Path achieving perfect art¹⁰¹.

By doing so he will be one with the Path and pass through the fire without being burnt and pass through the water without being wetted; he will be free from all pain and attain eternal youth and

守形，形乃長生。慎女內，閉女外，多知為敗。”

– 莊子：在宥, Zhuangzi: Zai You, III.

“是以聖人為無為之事，樂恬憺之能，從欲快志於虛無之守，故壽命無窮，與天地終，此聖人之治身也。”

– 黃帝內經：素問, Huang Di Nei Jing: Suwen, V: 9 or 陰陽應象大論, which most of the text is slightly less insane than the Dao about living a simple life without wine or such ‘modern practices’ as it indicates them as the cause for the ‘shorter lifespans today’ so that it goes on about what should be eaten and the Chinese ‘medicine’ about using random things for their spiritual properties to regenerate and heal the body just as some more concrete system about how certain behaviours in each season lead to different diseases and problems due to the nature of the wind, the hotness, the cold, the taste and so on; and then sprinkled here and there with madness it descends into passages like these where it so upholds that there are sages who follow the principle of no-action with a mind of pure emptiness which allows them to be tranquil and have no limit to their lifespan while ‘medicine and good habits can only extend it’ as their qi is not pure like those sages or the people of Primordial Simplicity.

¹⁰⁰ “鴻蒙曰：「意！心養。汝徒處無為，而物自化。墮爾形體，吐爾聰明；倫與物忘，大同乎溟涬；解心釋神，莫然無魂。萬物云云，各復其根，各復其根而不知。渾渾沌沌，終身不離；若彼知之，乃是離之。無問其名，無闕其情，物故自生。」雲將曰：「天降朕以德，示朕以默，躬身求之，乃今也得。」再拜稽首，起辭而行。”

– 莊子：在宥, Zhuangzi: Zai You, IV.

¹⁰¹ “庖丁為文惠君解牛，手之所觸，肩之所倚，足之所履，膝之所踣，砉然騞然，奏刀騞然，莫不中音。合於《桑林》之舞，乃中《經首》之會。文惠君曰：「譔！善哉！技蓋至此乎？」庖丁釋刀對曰：「臣之所好者道也，進乎技矣。始臣之解牛之時，所見無非牛者。三年之後，未嘗見全牛也。方今之時，臣以神遇，而不以目視，官知止而神欲行。依乎天理，批大郤，導大窾，因其固然。技經肯綮之未嘗，而況大軀乎！良庖歲更刀，割也；族庖月更刀，折也。今臣之刀十九年矣，所解數千牛矣，而刀刃若新發於硎。彼節者有間，而刀刃者無厚，以無厚入有間，恢恢乎其於游刃必有餘地矣，是以十九年而刀刃若新發於硎。雖然，每至於族，吾見其難為，怵然為戒，視為止，行為遲。動刀甚微，謦然已解，如土委地。提刀而立，為之四顧，為之躊躇滿志，善刀而藏之。」文惠君曰：「善哉！吾聞庖丁之言，得養生焉。」

– 莊子：養生主, Zhuangzi: Yangsheng Zhu, II, where there is this story about a cook perfectly cutting an ox on the exact places of joints and organs by letting his mind wander insensibly to be guided by the Path.

life¹⁴² – and by living inert of everything and never disagreeing from anything he will be loved by his wife ten times more than what she would want any man even if he is ugly enough to frighten the entire world while all men will be attracted to him who follows the Path giving him all power and government over them while they fear simply that he will not accept it.¹⁴³

Or is not the mountain harmed by the trees on it?¹⁴⁴ Is not with the very arts of fire that the ministers use that they are burnt? Are not the edible plants those that get plucked? Are not the useful woods those that get cut? Is it now because of the beauty of the tiger and of the leopard that they are hunted? Is it not by the skill of the dog and the monkey that they are captured? All known the advantages of being useful, but they are blind to the advantages of being useless; and by not acting or distinguishing himself he will find the true Path of peace and felicity.¹⁴⁵

¹⁴² “何謂真人？古之真人，不逆寡，不雄成，不謨士。若然者，過而弗悔，當而不自得也。若然者，登高不慄，入水不濡，入火不熱。是知能登假於道也若此。古之真人，其寢不夢，其覺無憂，其食不甘，其息深深。真人之息以踵，眾人之息以喉。屈服者，其嗟言若哇。其耆欲深者，其天機淺。”

– 莊子：大宗師, Zhuangzi: Da Zongshi, I.

¹⁴³ “魯哀公問於仲尼曰：「衛有惡人焉，曰哀駘它。丈夫與之處者，思而不能去也。婦人見之，請於父母曰『與為人妻，寧為夫子妾』者，十數而未止也。未嘗有聞其唱者也，常和而已矣。無君人之位以濟乎人之死，無聚祿以望人之腹。又以惡駭天下，和而不唱，知不出乎四域，且而雌雄合乎前。是必有異乎人者也。寡人召而觀之，果以惡駭天下。與寡人處，不至以月數，而寡人有意乎其為人；不至乎期年，而寡人信之。國無宰，寡人傳國焉。悶然而後應，汜然而若辭。寡人醜乎，卒授之國。無幾何也，去寡人而行，寡人卹焉若有亡也，若無與樂是國也。是何人者也？」”

– 莊子：德充符, Zhuangzi: De Chongfu, IV, ‘and his wife will love him ten times more than any other man’, I am not making this stuff up; that is really what the most classical texts say! But is that not still much less cringe than the eighty thousand servants and seventy two ‘virgins’, hours, promised in the Islamic hadiths?

¹⁴⁴ That is such a height of stupidity; when trees so greatly protect against the forces of erosion that reduce the mountain, but let us forge on.

¹⁴⁵ “山木自寇也，膏火自煎也。桂可食，故伐之；漆可用，故割之。人皆知有用之用，而莫知無用之用也。”

陽子居見老聃曰：「有人於此，嚮疾強梁，物微疏明，學道不倦。如是者，可比明王乎？」老聃曰：「是於聖人也，胥易技係，勞形怵心者也。且也虎豹之文來田，猿狙之便、執鰲之狗來藉。如是者，可比明王乎？」陽子居蹇然曰：「敢問明王之治。」老聃曰：「明王之治，功蓋天下而似不自己，化貸萬物而民弗恃，有莫舉名，使物自喜，立乎不測，而遊於無有者也。」”

– 莊子：人間世, Zhuangzi: Renjianshi, IX and 莊子：應帝王, Zhuangzi: Ying Di Wang, IV.

Of which we have a curious example in ‘حكاية التاجر مع الغريت’, The Merchant And The Ifrit, where it says that ‘only the fruitful trees are stoned; and the depths of water are only disturbed because they produce pearls’; and if you refer back to the critic of Aristotle early to ostracism, ‘cutting away the best ears of corn’, you can see again the absolute harm of such practice used as a tool of tyrants for control – how much more insane to do it to ourselves in the believe of ‘the perfection of nature’!

That is the Way of the grand all-permeating Dao; even the smallest of things are produced through it by obeying it, but it does not brag about accomplishing its work, and although it covers everything it does not brags about being a lord over them – even the greatest of things return to it, but it does not make itself known as their doing so.¹⁴⁶

The Dao follows its course doing nothing, but there is nothing left undone by it; if governments were to obey it they would be transformed by it, but even if that becomes an object of desire it will only lead to Nameless Simplicity – Nameless Simplicity has no purpose or desire and with no desire it rests still letting all things under the Heavens follow their will.¹⁴⁷

Such is the horror of Dao, the ‘Path’, and it is a disease which has reduced a large part of humankind to a station of greater suffering, and uselessness, than any other time in human history – it is some baseless belief with imaginary aims, as the Platonic one, but we can call it distinct since those Platonic are simply stagnant of all progress while this one is a more violent illness which aims at reducing humankind to true vegetative insapience.

Laissez faire, and the idea of some unknowable invisible hand, is just a lighter shade of this Daoist disease¹⁴⁸.

The arts of science are the only improvement we have achieved; and through the foresight of knowledge in Economy we have to shape the environment to direct it to produce any beneficial result – there is no self-organizing perfect Path that will devoid of all thought and reason produce that improvement that we want.

To heal the pain of going through that let us look at wonderful Hippocrates again and see why we went through such baseless stupidity of religion at all; that to try to cure any disease the best first

¹⁴⁶ “大道汎兮，其可左右。萬物恃之而生而不辭，功成不名有。衣養萬物而不為主，常無欲，可名為小；萬物歸焉，而不為主，可名為大。以其終不自為大，故能成其大。”

- 道德經, Dao De Jing, XXXIV.

¹⁴⁷ “道常無為而無不為。侯王若能守之，萬物將自化。化而欲作，吾將鎮之以無名之樸。無名之樸，夫亦將無欲。不欲以靜，天下將自定。”

- 道德經, Dao De Jing, XXXIV.

¹⁴⁸ Modern Daoism is polluted with Buddhist nonsense, but of this later and Hinduism there is no point in talking; they teach that silent endurance of suffering as something praiseworthy condemning people to eternal misery instead of taking action to avert that to himself and to his children preventing them to even leave a better world than what they found – and the usual bunch of insane rituals and random practices for imaginary aims under the threat of being reborn as something that suffers even more and the promises of finally dying forever leaving the reincarnation wheel of the Samsara.

As it is the characterise of all such unreal norms or doctrines, from the loose guesswork of moralism or the structured fantasies of religion, to merely perpetuate misery.

step is to product the prognosis inferring the past in what are the causes of such, analysing the present of how such acts and then predict the future in what such will do – and from that we elicit the cure that will bring a better future, alleviate the present and the prevention so that such harmful past is not repeated again.¹⁴⁹

So not only is the undirected selection of laissez faire useless even if it did optimize the momentary production it would be just as momentary in its benefits; rather our intellect unveils that quasi-invisible hand so that we can shape the environment to select for the desired outcome – which is the progress and improvement of humankind, by the literal advancement of our sciences, rather than any immediate and stagnant ‘optimal production’.

I wish I could praise Fa, ‘Legalism’, but their measures were not only shockingly brutal in their intolerance, but they were absolutely atrocious in the self-harm caused by that guesswork of prejudices; yet it still was a giant step for humankind to get rid of the traditional Chinese religion in order to try some germ of scientific freedom – which, if it had not been promptly destroyed, might have given rise to science of Economics in the east.

Our modern science, ‘Capitalism’, is a very nice simplistic model, but has been stuck on its infancy since its incipience; upon which this worthless doctrines of the ‘free market’ preyed upon – and here on this treaty I have endeavoured to show how it is to grow in understanding the cumulative action of that cause and effect between supply and demand in filling up niches within the economy, so that the purpose of Economic Science is to regulate the economic landscape so that those optimal niches for the individual strategies converge with that which is beneficial to the State.

Which benefit can be soldiers or food or any other thing when facing the threat of annihilation in war or famine, but those with the goal of stabilization upon which with survival assured it is only now the intellectual gains of progressing science that will improve the quality of life by increasing the Power of the State.

The Platonic States with their moralist regulations shoot blinding missing their aim; while the Free Market wanders lost to the long-term benefit of no one – Economy, instead, is the art of using this our knowledge about capital to engineer that landscape so that it selects with purpose to produce a desired end goal.

¹⁴⁹ “Τὸν ἡτρὸν δοκέει μοι ἄριστον εἶναι πρόνοιαν ἐπιτηδεύειν προγινώσκων γὰρ καὶ πολέγων παρὰ τοῖσι νοσέουσι τὰ τε παρεόντα καὶ τὰ προγεγονότα καὶ τὰ μέλλοντα ἔσεσθαι, ὁκόσα τε παραλείπουσιν οἱ ἀσθενέοντες ἐκδιηγούμενος, πιστεύοιτ’ ἂν μᾶλλον γινώσκειν τὰ τῶν νοσεόντων πρήγματα, ὥστε τολμᾶν ἐπitrέπειν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους σφρέας ἑωυτοὺς τῷ ἡτρῷ. Τὴν δὲ θεραπείην ἄριστα ἂν ποιεόιτο, προειδῶς τὰ ἐσόμενα ἐκ τῶν παρεόντων παθημάτων. “
– Προγνωστικόν, Prognostication, I.

The Social Environment

I – Political Science

There is no more loathsome misery amongst the evils that befall mankind than the torture of knowing that some undesirable fate is coming, but lacking the power to save oneself from it¹⁵⁰; and although I love to use that line against the cult of ignorance opposing the progress of medicine by fearing genetic engineering and thus condemning us to meet the Destroyer of All Delight¹⁵¹, it can be perfectly used in this broader sense of all economy and government – evils we can foresee, but that are most often brought about by the mismanagement of our systems or that when they are not directly caused by them that it cannot be escaped because of that same incompetence.

After considering this proper and exact course of Economics I could go on repeating the entire argument with examples of how Legislation and all other aspects of government and society have been plagued by those same problems, but that would be rather meaningless and endlessly tiresome¹⁵²; rather it suffices to say that such is the case and by pure moralistic guesswork have every law and measure been passed instead of any sound foundation – for example the entirety of this last philosophical craze, the Renaissance, have been about ideals of ‘human rights’ and ‘freedom’ and ‘equality’, which are as impossible, and as harmful, to society as that ‘arithmetical equality’ in Economy treated just above.

¹⁵⁰ “ἐχθίστη δὲ ὁδὺν ἐστὶ τῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποισι αὐτῇ, πολλὰ φρονέοντα μηδενὸς κρατεῖν”
– Ιστορίαι, Histories, IX: 16.

¹⁵¹ The term for Death often found at the end of tales in Arabian literature; rather than a ‘happily ever after’ they ‘lived on happily until they met the Destroyer of All Delight’.

¹⁵² “περὶ ὧν οὐχ οἶόν τε διὰ τῆς γραφῆς τὸν κατὰ μέρος ἀποδοῦναι λόγον· καθάπερ γὰρ ἐπὶ τῶν διαφερόντων πυκτῶν καὶ ταῖς γενναιότησι καὶ ταῖς εὐεξίαις, ὅταν εἰς τὸν ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ τοῦ στεφάνου συγκαταστάντες καιρὸν διαμάχωνται πληγὴν ἐπὶ πληγῇ τιθέντες ἀδιαπαύστως, λόγον μὲν ἢ πρόνοιαν ἔχειν ὑπὲρ ἐκάστης ἐπιβολῆς καὶ πληγῆς οὔτε τοῖς ἀγωνιζομένοις οὔτε τοῖς θεωμένοις ἐστὶ δυνατόν, ἐκ δὲ τῆς καθόλου τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐνεργείας καὶ τῆς ἐκατέρου φιλοτιμίας ἐστὶ καὶ τῆς ἐμπειρίας αὐτῶν καὶ τῆς δυνάμεως, πρὸς δὲ καὶ τῆς εὐψυχίας, ἱκανὴν ἔννοιαν λαβεῖν, οὕτως δὲ καὶ περὶ τῶν νῦν λεγομένων στρατηγῶν. τὰς μὲν γὰρ αἰτίας ἢ τοὺς τρόπους, δι’ ὧν ἂν ἐκάστην ἡμέραν ἐποιοῦντο κατ’ ἀλλήλων ἐνέδρας, ἀντενέδρας, ἐπιθέσεις, προσβολάς, οὗτ’ ἂν ὁ γράφων ἐξαριθμοῦμενος ἐφίκοιτο, τοῖς τ’ ἀκούουσιν ἀπέραντος ἅμα δ’ ἀνωφελὲς ἂν ἐκ τῆς ἀναγνώσεως γίνοιτο χρεῖα· ἐκ δὲ τῆς καθολικῆς ἀποφάσεως περὶ αὐτῶν καὶ τοῦ τέλους τῆς φιλοτιμίας μᾶλλον ἂν τις εἰς ἔννοιαν ἔλθοι τῶν προειρημένων.”

– Ιστορία Πολυβίου, Histories from Polybius, I, where he beautifully puts an alike sentiment that none could write every word said and every movement made by the soldiers in a war nor could any reader endure such meaningless task of reading through those worthless details; so that I too set the generalization and principle which can be then applied to any infinity of problems to find the due solution, rather than an endless list of applications.

And so we can follow on with every law; the product of how those in power felt that others should behave with no base or purposed besides that imaginary aim¹³³ – with the wildest results wandering through meaningless path of endless suffering in stagnancy and regression, since consideration of goals and any logic of scientific exactness have never been part of the decision-making at all.

Selection of the chance beneficial idea has rarely occurred, but even then it is both far from optimal and drowned amid the cursed moralism of purposeless norms.

Thus here we shall take on from this last part and quickly see how those too are exact laws; concerning simply the engineering of the social environment in order to select for some optimal good.

The reader might feel he has grasped that by the examples of the previous part and it might be true that the seeds of understanding have taken root, but overcoming all this culture so violently hammered into us as preconceived notions of morality is no easy task; so we will visit some very violent examples which still triggers so many people when they meaninglessly yell at each other about humanitarian compassion or justified harshness in criminal law – let us see how so perfectly wrong they are in achieving any good or goal with their, and our current, laws.

First some to our modern epidemic as if there was any lack of mockery and criticism upon the accursed hell that is Democracy; and then after quickly dealing with the structure of government in general in how Legislation too is thoroughly flawed.

Let us, for example, take normative phrase of ‘we should respect the elderly’, which is one of the most common dogma across cultures; and although at this point it can only remind us from the Platonic stupidity in his *Politeia* and the ‘normative’ nature of it already disgusts us in how meaning it is, let us analyse it since it is such a common line still today and often enforced in the education of children.

Should we then disrespect young and adult people? Or is it comparative respecting only those older than ourselves?

¹³³ That is, rather than asking ‘why are people racist?’, ‘why did some culture evolve to discriminate some sexual orientation?’ or ‘why veganism exist’ we do not waste time on all such particular cases in how exactly they formed that wrong notion to instead follow Plato in directly dealing with the source of the problem; this is the question ‘why do people form wrong opinions at all?’ – which is what I have endeavoured to show with all the criticism to normatism, and that the cure to all such is having a proper method of producing any answer from some common axioms from facts.

That is the positivism of the Scientific Method; and which here I extend further with Logical Succession to what that Method implies when compounded – the accumulative result of causes and effects, the Selection of some certain effect from the causes of the Environment.

That sounds like the twisted and intentional misinterpretations that victimized partisan groups use in transforming the statement 'I like this something' into 'I hate this something else', but it is not so; since respect is being correlated positively with the criterion of age so that it is indeed saying that the less less old you are the less respect you get.

But even Plato with his partiality to the elderly said that they should instead be humiliated and forbidden to receive any respect or be obeyed if he happened to not be virtuous; for who will pay a respect to a child abuser just because he is old? Rather most will think that to be an even greater shame and crime for an old man at that stage of life to be doing such a thing.

We have then that 'we should respect the elderly iff they are virtuous'; which makes the age criterion superfluous and that rather we simply should respect the virtuous – there is no relation between the age of the individual and some magic inherent merit to respect.

But as we have seen 'merit' is merely our made-up criteria to receive something; and the normativism of 'should' is both meaningless as a statement and further only harmful to society – rather, then, we deal with the problem of 'what effect will there be on society if we link the criterion of age to the respect received?'.

Which then as we start any consideration on that question we see how stupid of a criterion it is; a reward to no good done to the State nor any achievement, but a purely imaginary value – and thus an encumbrance of no gain to be taught or enforced, but a pure waste.

That is how to properly analyse or make any meaningful statement in government; it is the art of building an environment that selects for 'virtue', and 'virtue' is whatever our ultimate goal is – by establishing an understanding of the invariable reality before us we produce the framework upon which we can thus differentiate what is beneficial to the State from the imaginary aims of moralism, and further the path to be followed in order to attain that aim.

A given today is 'the right of inheritance' where, perhaps meaningless to explain, the offspring and wife or closest living kin of a man receives his goods at the event his death; Plato follows the ancient ways of full inheritance with exclusion of the daughters and favouritism to the oldest son, Heinrich quite opposite banishes inheritance entirely with each person building his own comfortable life by his own work and modern States take a middle term with virtually full inheritance up to some arbitrary amount of wealth where some extra taxes come in.

And who would have guessed; Heinrich is actually right!

In the ideal State we have the environment that thus selects for the most qualified to yield the powers of Wealth and Authority; the best farmer controls the optimal portion of the arable lands as that most efficient usage of the resources will produce food at the lowest cost to all the inhabitants and to the State itself, just as the governor is that most skillful Statesman not as a partiality to the man himself but because that is the best for all – now, how ridiculous is it to us

today the ancient method of 'primogeniture' with the son of a monarch succeeding him in government or of the farm owner and any other trade?

All that benefit of the genial farmer and statesman would last but one generation if the criterion for the selection of the successor to that power was that meaningless biological, or legal, first son; and so too in all inheritance, that power of wealth and authority belong truly to the State and to maintain the good of all it has to be passed on to the next optimal choice of him most fit to perform that function – which is a criterion of, once again, skills alone with no 'age' or genetical likeness or legal will being any factor at all in that choice.

In the enquiry into equality we have not gone over the other common complaint that some are simply born rich owning land while receiving the production of the actual workers; on which point we have that Communist stupidity that they would thus remain so as a 'bourgeoisie class' that always enslave the 'proletariat' – but to which we simply repeat that point about being born on some 'good fertile land', where the worthless managers will just ruin themselves to a worse station rather than improving what was left for him.

Which is, again, not reality the optimal management of the resources of the State; a problem of what that system of free competition selects for, and not the mindlessness of 'Equality' – rather, again, to maintain that twist belief of arithmetical equality, or 'for geometrical equality to truly exist', of 'no one being born with any advantage over the other' we would have to throw our children away in the wilderness to be destitute of everything so they can all 'start from the same place in order for meritocracy to exist'.

Which is, of course, both impossible to achieve any 'equality' even then as the weather there will be variable by the seasons and those put there during storm or rain will have very little chance of survival in comparison with those that happened to be born under fair weather or all the natural aptitudes and genetic diseases or benefits inherited; to which there it said 'so that being impossible to force the inapt to succeed the only way would be to force all to fail' and which here means that we cannot fix their legs and deficiencies so we would have to harm all those born healthy as the only thing that can be done in order to make them equal and even then they would still be quite different genetically – to the conclusion then that if we were to perform all that for the sake of 'equality', is that all not pure mindless beliefs that cause only evil with no relation to actual goods and benefits to society?

Sum of the argument which I repeat in order to keep far away any thought that we have any view of that meaningless 'equality' when we establish the non-inheritance system, or rather simply get rid of the inheritance system, but far from all such normalism we consider the reality of what will most benefit the entire State; thus even abolishing inheritance the sons of that rich man will grow in all that luxury and comfort of his father or grandfather, even in the Communist system, having the benefits of the best education and so on, and even not inheriting any of that physical wealth he will inevitably have all those connections of acquaintances and friends he made during his life –

of which they might support and raise some lazy person who has never worked in his life if they so wish just as some might wish to raise to old age some incapacitated person who from an accident or birth defect is unable to contribute to the State being just a weight and detriment.

The interference with that system for the sake of the moralist norms that 'all should work' and so on is, of course, worse than useless, as we have seen the absolute detriment all such norms are; we extend our hand so far as we have a sound and exact plan that can truly increase the total Power of the State; and hindering the deservingly wealthy, or even the struggling poor, from raising their mentally disabled son or just their lazy hikikomori would rather cost resources just to increasing the suffering of those who decided to shoulder that monetary detriment for the sake of those they love.

Those are pretty much economic measures and might seem to belong to the previous section, but truly everything is; the division of the disciplines Physics and Economics is entirely arbitrary, and so how much less distinct are those of politics, economy and legislation from each other – the classification existing merely by whim of our imagination in order to summarize and classify some related phenomena, but nothing truly fits neatly in any single category, and far from each being unique and distinct they are all parts of a same whole within the study of human society as a small part of neurology within biology in our greater framework of chemistry.

Botar o coisa da propaganda lá das casas vs predios e de caça contra os animais? E então de veganismo; exemplos que fogem da convencional ideia de política e religiões, mas que idênticamente são simplesmente a mesma classe de ideias sobre comportamento por alguma razão e objetivo - qual imprestável pseudo-filosofia qual militam é assim imprestáveis ações para fins puramente imaginários quais apenas atrapalham a conquista de reais bens à sociedade.

*this scene was rather ridiculous and uses many extra beliefs in other pseudosciences that happen to be convenient to their preconceived notions, but there is no canon text of doctrines which they abide to and thus they are so commonly found together with those other worthless things as they are all fantastical ideas with vague notions and ambiguous aims with no relation to our reality.

II – Τὸ Κράτος Τοῦ Δήμου

Many of the greatest writers in humankind have exerted all the power of their ridicule upon Democracy; it was a joke to the rest of the world – even in Chinese ancient classics where it did not even exist but as a mere idea – throughout all of History even in the shadow of the Parthenon.

And yet, this deranged trend has taken over the world in these last two centuries.

Let us avoid the tautology of repeating what has been so many times said by others, and said well,¹⁵⁴ by both illustrations and historical events to instead sketch what environment that system builds; and thus what it invariably selects for – what then explains all the examples of philosophy and history why it is truly so awful of a system.

Let us hit off with the famous classic that is the amazing ship analogy of Plato; which name by now you might have some aversion to paying any attention to, but although so flawed in the end he is beautifully correct in many of his critics – most often he fails at providing a satisfactory answer, not in criticing evil.

On his example there is a ship at sea with the sailors competing for the helm; the condition of which is merely to convince the blind and ignorant owner of the vessel to give them that power, so that each endeavours to please with favours and drugs in order to receive the desired authority over the boat – and the philosopher who studying the stars is the only one truly able to navigate is rather called an useless star-gazer who not pleasing the owner with favours and gifts or pleasant predictions is thus ignored.¹⁵⁵

¹⁵⁴ “δῆλον ὡς οὐδενὶ μὲν ἂν δόξαι καθήκειν περὶ τῶν καλῶς καὶ πολλοῖς εἰρημένων ταυτολογεῖν, ἥκιστα δ’ ἡμῖν.”

– Ιστορία Πολυβίου, Histories from Polybius, I, where he has this line amid his gorgeous introduction to the history of the Roman conquest of Greece; and whence we would do well to follow his advice about looking into history to learn of politics and how the current world was thus shaped, in which study then you can have fun applying this method of mine of Logical Succession to see if, as I claim, it can truly describe all human affairs seeing both where they went wrong and what would be the proper course of action.

¹⁵⁵ “νόησον γὰρ τοιοῦτον γινόμενον εἴτε πολλῶν νεῶν περὶ εἴτε μιᾶς ναύκληρον μεγέθει μὲν καὶ ῥώμῃ ὑπὲρ τοὺς ἐν τῇ νηὶ πάντας, ὑπόκοπον δὲ καὶ ὀρῶντα ὡσαύτως βραχύ τι καὶ γινώσκοντα περὶ ναυτικῶν ἕτερα τοιαῦτα, τοὺς δὲ ναύτας στασιάζοντας πρὸς ἀλλήλους περὶ τῆς κυβερνήσεως, ἕκαστον οἰόμενον δεῖν κυβερνᾶν, μήτε μαθόντα πόποτε τὴν τέχνην μέτε ἔχοντα ἀποδεῖξαι διδάσκαλον ἑαυτοῦ μηδὲ χρόνον ἐν ᾧ ἐμάνθανεν, πρὸς δὲ τούτοις φάσκοντας μηδὲ διδασκὸν εἶναι, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν λέγοντα ὡς διδασκὸν ἐτοιμοὺς κατατέμνειν, αὐτοὺς δὲ αὐτῷ ἀεὶ τῷ ναυκλήρῳ περιεχρῶσθαι δεομένους καὶ πάντα ποιοῦντας ὅπως ἂν σφίσι τὸ πηδάλιον ἐπιτρέψῃ, ἐνίοτε δ’ ἂν μὴ πείθωσιν ἀλλὰ ἄλλοι μᾶλλον, τοὺς μὲν ἄλλους ἢ ἀποκτείνοντας ἢ ἐκβάλλοντας ἐκ τῆς νεῆς, τὸν δὲ γενναῖον ναύκληρον μανδραγόρῃ ἢ μέθῃ ἢ τινὶ ἄλλῳ συμποδίσαντας τῆς νεῆς ἄρχειν χρωμένους τοῖς ἐνοῦσι, καὶ πίνοντας τε καὶ εὐωχομένους πλεῖν ὡς τὸ εἰκὸς τοὺς τοιοῦτους, πρὸς δὲ τούτοις ἐπαινοῦντας ναυτικὸν μὲν καλοῦντας καὶ κυβερνητικὸν καὶ ἐπιστάμενον τὰ κατὰ ναῦν, ὃς ἂν συλλαμβάνειν δεινὸς ἢ ὅπως ἄρξουσιν ἢ πείθοντες ἢ βιαζόμενοι τὸν ναύκληρον, τὸν δὲ μὴ τοιοῦτον

There is much to unpack of it, but I will leave that critic of the people for later using Gorgias; for now let us analyse the direct results of those choices before seeing how they came to be because that described environment thus invariably selects for that tragedy.

To a modern reader a ship does not sound like something dangerous at all as it was the deadly art of seafaring two millenia ago, besides all the hyper-specific critics to the old ideas of unteachable skills and so on, so that we can better show the crucial urgency by using a plane; and by first having a proper introduction on which the reader admits the existence of the art itself before we then contrast its necessity, as on his Politician – what is exactly what I wrote in a sudden inspiration midway through my reading of the Politician.

I start the dialogue saying ‘Do you call a governor a thing?’, which imitation of Platonic absurdity is just beautiful and which naturally sets the flow of the dialogue as the opposing character answers with the only possible reply of ‘What?’.

‘You recognize that there are some you call doctors, do you not? And yet others you call architects. Or do you not use such names?’

‘I do.’

‘And is a doctor and an architect different?’

‘Certainly.’

‘Why?’

‘Because they do completely different things!’

‘A doctor heals and an architect designs buildings?’

‘By necessity.’

‘And do all people heal and design buildings, or only those that are qualified by that certain science and knowledge of medicine and architecture?’

‘Only those.’

ψέγοντας ὡς ἄχρηστον, τοῦ δὲ ἀληθινοῦ κυβερνήτου περὶ μηδ’ ἐπαίοντες, ὅτι ἀνάγκη αὐτῷ τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν ποιεῖσθαι ἐνῆαντοῦ καὶ ὠρῶν καὶ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἀστρῶν καὶ πνευμάτων καὶ πάντων τῶν τῇ τέχνῃ προσηκόντων, εἰ μέλλει τῷ ὄντι νεὸς ἀρχικὸς ἔσεσθαι, ὅπως δὲ κυβερνήσει ἔαντε τινες βούλονται ἔαντε μή, μήτε τέχνην τούτου μήτε μελέτην οἰόμενοι δυνατὸν εἶναι λαβεῖν ἅμα καὶ τὴν κυβερνητικὴν. τοιούτων δὴ περὶ τὰς ναῦς γιγνομένων τὸν ὡς ἀληθῶς κυβερνητικὸν οὐχ ἰγῆ ἂν τῷ ὄντι μετεωροσκόπον τε καὶ ἀδολέσχην καὶ ἄχρηστὸν σφισι καλεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἐν ταῖς οὕτω κατεσκευασμέναις ναυσὶ πλωτῆρων;”

– Πολιτεία, Politeia, VI: 488a-489a.

‘Thus the name doctors and architects you call things, but if everyone had the same qualifications there would be no meaning in calling one or other a doctor or an architect; but there is because it separates those with the science from those without.’

‘Granted.’

‘Do you call, then, governors a thing? Or are all men equally apt to write laws and manage the affairs of the state?’

‘Some might better than others, ergo by necessity I have to call it a thing.’

‘For I indeed dare say I can do all those three, and many others, mostly excellently; better than you and many others. So I agree and I too call it a thing. Now let us dive in a most ridiculous event. Have you ever been on Europe?’

‘I have.’

‘You have, surely, come and gone by plane? For boats are less convenient in time.’

‘By plane, surely.’

‘And there was one you called the captain and pilot of the vessel?’

‘Obviously!’

‘And you trusted your life on his skill in the science of piloting?’

‘By necessity.’

‘And would you trust it to one who did not have skill in piloting?’

‘By no means!’

‘But now imagine the captain fainted.’

‘Very well; he has and I imagine it, to our despair.’

‘And for such occasions there is a co-pilot who is thus trained in the same art and is himself a pilot so that he may inherit and serve as heir to the duties of his predecessor.’

‘Indeed there is. ‘

‘Now imagine the crew went into mutiny and, as a revolution, disposed of the heir to take upon themselves the control of their own lives; even when they have no whatsoever qualification, but as

it concerns their future they feel the necessity to decide the course and manner themselves – so that they deliberate on how to fly the plane and put to vote the press of every button and each twist of the wheel.’

‘That is a most ridiculous situation indeed, by Zeus!’

‘Do you agree with me then that a terrible fate awaits them, due to their unskilled decisions and inefficiency in performing the task?’

‘Perfectly.’

‘Even when they are many and discuss things amid themselves?’

‘Even then.’

‘And if they vote between them who they like more or the best orator who can convince them to give their vote, would that be better?’

‘Not better.’

‘Because they are not pilots?’

‘Precisely so.’

‘And the same for doctors and architects? Or should the multitude of sick be said to know what is better for their bodies and the future tenants or observers of art how to best construct a structure?’

‘Certainly for them too.’

‘And to all arts it should always be better done by those qualified?’

‘Most surely.’

‘And you call a governor a thing for there is such art as politics and law-making, and not all are skilled in them, but a few and whom we call governors, do you not?’

‘I admit.’

‘How then can a State fare any better than our democratic plane? For the people, who are wholly ignorant of the art of governing, put in their representative by vote; by popularity with the unskilled and not by qualification – thus all we see on all such democracies is a mass of corruption by those most popular orators who managed to win with empty promises and by granting to the slight majority parties and gifts and offices to buy and bribe their way into power,

for no other strategy can compete with that for the best chance of winning so that there will never be any successful endeavour such a system of government.'

'But that is an unfair comparison; the plane has no time to discuss and the disaster is instantaneous.'

'Do you accuse me then of using violent words so that with fear I might coerce you into accepting my argument?'

'I claim no such malice, but that it is unfitting.'

'Then let us go back, have you not said all arts partake of it?'

'I have, but that is rather a vague assertion and its meaning unexplained.'

'I will endeavour then to make the meaning clearer then.'

'Please go on then for the sake of us both.'

'Would you say now that it is of no case if your house has been made by an architect or any random person?'

'A house too can fall down and take my life, if built by one without knowledge of architecture.'

'A doctor, then, is indifferent if he knows not about health?'

'Certainly not; and once again I am put into dire straights.'

'What then, my holy man? The work of a cartographer?'

'That too he would need geography or many would perish by following his maps.'

'A historian?'

'Of those the works would be useless, were he not to know the facts.'

'A teacher, then? For now you cannot expect any mortal peril if he is just ignorant.'

'Perhaps not directly, but either of the youth being misled or any thinking that he learnt while he is in fact ignorant is a grave danger indeed...'

'By the gods, then! A baker, perhaps? Whose job is so harmless in just producing food.'

'I would lie if I say I cared not if he can make good bread or not.'

‘And in a mistake of ferment or other additives he could indeed induce many ills to the bodies. What art then are you saying the argument does not apply, so that you wanted to retract what you admitted before? For he who knows is always better than he who is ignorant; and if even on the smallest of matters we require them to know how could we not do so in such grave matters which rule over all others, such as the business of the state? For we, and our children in the future, would be doomed if all we do is either wasted or misled by being managed and cared for by ignorant inept hands rather than dextrous ones. Or do you still contend?’

‘No; certainly not. I see the aiming now and all I can say is that I share one mind with it, although how can I abandon what seemed so good to me before I still am unsure...’

With this pretty little thing, whose extent of the emulation of the Platonic style feels like mockery while still being so beautiful, I combined the structure of the Stateman with the argument of the skilful management of the ship of the State, but with the rather different focus of the urgency of the arts; as seen by the understandable danger of immediate death by having someone who cannot pilot the plane – an ignorance of skill and thus inability of judgment which people can readily admit on that situation preferring to give someone that responsibility of both piloting and choosing, but on so many others often they are not so prompt at admitting or even are ignorant of their own absolute ignorance.

Once upon a time we knew not what was safe to eat; and as always of nothing was worth any vote from the masses to decide that – rather someone had to eat it and we observe the reality of the results, knowing it did nothing or perhaps how it killed or left the individual very sick.

From that moment those were no longer as ignorant; they could instruct others and were the only ones with ‘knowledge’ rather than any ‘opinion’ – repeating that scientific method we have drawn giant lists of what is good to eat, the evil that some plants or fungi do and in a much more deficient way the medicinal effects that some of them can have.

The lack of all rigorosity and control left that list very flawed just as the introduction of many imaginary dangers and rituals of cure from the superstitions of the ignorant, but that general usefulness of the knowledge made it survive.

About the entire history of the human race later we developed the methods of chemistry understanding how all micro and macro objects are built; so that we know what compounds are hurtful, and why they are so reacting with said interaction sites in our bodies, and what truly can heal us – so infinitely better than the risks from before, and allowing us to thus build real medicine treating diseases.

There is not any ‘belief’ in medicine; they are no occult mysteries nor is there any ‘faith’ in science – any can learnt and prove it to himself if so he feels inclined to do as science does not claim wildly from its imagination, but describes step by step why that thing is thus or is not thus.

From those first experiments who ate poisonous mushrooms we have developed that difference between knowledge and opinion; at first truly they had to take a guess and try things, but that risk and democratic thing only happens when all are equally ignorant – once they have started building that knowledge further the opinion and guesswork of the ignorant became meaningless and of no what so ever worth, rather it is worse than useless as we see on our current age of denial the vaccines which have been so effective in eradicating the horrible misery of diseases that people have drifted to the culture of convenient ignorance denying that misery ever existed.

As worthless and harmful those opinions of the ignorant are if we listen to them as equally valid as the art of medicine, or more than it since there are more ignorant people advocating for it than there are scientists, so too is the voice of the ignorant masses in all things of the art of government; that is the point of my scene.

Which is what I have shown on the previous section; in how meaningless all ‘opinions’ are, and that ‘science’ far from that is rather than any guesswork just a reflection of reality – reality and truth which are not democratic, but which will wreak its ravages regardless of the daydreams and baseless ideals of the ignorant masses.

Which we can see the starkest shows of absolute disaster caused directly by the masses imposing their will in the conflict of the two orders in Rome and the election of the worthless tribunes, as at the tragedy of Cannae¹⁵⁶ with Roman incompetence in subduing its own plebeians being the

¹⁵⁶ “Erat autem Philopoemen praecipuae in ducendo agmine locisque capiendis sollertiae atque usus, nec belli tantum temporibus sed etiam in pace ad id maxime animum exercuerat. ubi iter quopiam faceret et ad difficilem transitu saltum uenisset, contemplatus ab omni parte loci naturam, cum solus iret secum ipse agitabat animo, cum comites haberet ab his quaerebat, si hostis eo loco apparuisset, quid si a fronte, quid si ab latere hoc aut illo, quid si ab tergo adoriretur capiendum consilii foret: posse instructos directa acie, posse inconditum agmen et tantummodo aptum uiae occurrere. quem locum ipse capturus esset cogitando aut quaerendo exsequeretur, aut quot armatis aut quo genere armorum—plurimum enim interesse—usus; quo impedimenta, quo sarcinas, quo turbam inermem reiceret; quanto ea aut quali praesidio custodiret; et utrum pergere qua coepisset ire uia an eam qua uenisset repetere melius esset; castris quoque quem locum caperet, quantum munimento ampleretur loci, qua opportuna aquatio, qua pabuli lignorumque copia esset; qua postero die castra mouenti tutum maxime iter, quae forma agminis esset. his curis cogitationibusque ita ab ineunte aetate animum agitaerat ut nulla ei noua in tali re cogitatio esset.”

– Ab Urbe Condita, From the Founding of the City, XXXV: 28, where thus is described how Philopoemen was skilled in directing both the march and the selection of positions be it in peace or war time; since he had the habit to study the ground all around when travelling through hard mountain passes. Thinking it to himself when alone and asking to others what should be done if an enemy were to appear at that or that other point, what tactics to use against a front attack or a flank one or a rear one, or how to deal with the enemy that came with their ranks in proper position for battle while they were thus in the column of march; what place should he secure then and how to arrange his troops in number and weapons to face that and where to send the baggage carriers and supplies while the soldiers thus took formation for battle – what part of the army should be used as guard to those supplies and what part be engaged in front and what part to relieve them after or what part should be sent to outflank them. Should they then fight going forward ahead to their original destination or should they retreat whence they came now? After doing so where should he set his campsite; how much work should be spent on raising defensive structures around it – and whence should he obtain the water, wood and fodder for maintaining the camp? What route would be safest for them to take on the

source of the legendary success of Hanibal, or the Athenians on the conduct of the Peloponnesian war¹⁵⁷.

morrow and in what formation? It is thus said how his mind had pondered those things from his youth so that he could so effectively use the army.

“Ille ut impune primo discordias serentes concitent finitima bella, deinde adversus ea quae concitaverint armari civitatem defendique prohibeant, et cum hostes tantum non arcesserint, exercitus conscribi adversus hostes non patiantur, sed audeat Canuleius in senatu proloqui se nisi suas leges tamquam victoris patres accipi sinant dilectum haberi prohibiturum? Quid esse aliud quam minari se proditurum patriam, oppugnari atque capi passurum!”

- Ab Urbe Condita, From the Founding of the City, IV: 2, meanwhile for the tribunes the dangers of war was a chance to blackmail the Senate into accepting their demands or they would boycott the raising of the army!

The people would allow the enemies to sack allied cities and plunder the fields; refusing to enlist for war until some whimsical law was passed – and desiring to also command they forced the Senate to allow them to choose amongst themselves whoever they wanted to lead the army so that for no gain to anyone they caused horrible tragedies for the Republic simply because they wanted to feel like they had equality of power and authority too, stupid tribunes who foolhardness and absolute ignorance of military affairs made them ignore all council of the skilled patricians to rather just command the army to charge blinding amid awful terrain and exhaustion after getting first sight of the enemy.

¹⁵⁷ From which infinitude of examples we can mention here from the Hellenica, Ελληνικά, where Ksenophon, although perhaps a little partial against his homeland, describes the height of madness and licentiousness the Athenians had come to at that point; specially at I: VII where we have the rightfully vainglorious Alcibiades being calumniated endlessly by the demagogues at home while he is out there commanding the most important endeavour of Athenian cause – but by some baseless accusation of pointless impious vandalism they force him to abandon the war in order to come back and be judged by it, with he himself just fleeing into exile as he knows the temper of the people just seeking for a scapegoat after bribed slaves denounced him as the magical sacrifice to expiate all that imaginary sin.

Losing his homeland and having a reward offered for his head he starts helping the enemy with both his overwhelming knowledge of the Athenian situation and his skills; achieving thus victories, but being distrusted he is target of slander from the opposing party so that chaos-bringing Alcibiades flees with his sweet councils to the Persians – at which point fallen from Periclean glory into the pits of despair as their own insular empire rose in revolt not only losing all the source of revenue and soldiers to replace the disastrous expeditions where they spent so much of their money, youths and their might fleet but also with party sedition collapsing the city from the inside nearly at civil war when the enemy could invade by land or sea as they were devoid of fleet or soldiers with their very army having elected the exiled Alcibiades their leader. So thus it makes them promptly ignore those meaningless accusations and open hand of even their democracy to have him back as their only hope; suddenly jumping from a condemnation of death for some baseless accusation of vandalism upon sacred statues to giving him the supreme power over the them, killing his slanderers to gratify him into accepting – upon which he attains unbelievable success on their hopeless situation, but the deranged people tasting victory again rise back to that boundless Athenian insolence which the gods themselves, by plagues and storms, can hardly contain so that at the first setback the whimsical masters of the world, for the detrimental of all, vote to take the power away from him since they want to rule themselves again and so they confer the command upon ten random commanders they elect there on the fly.

All this pretext is already absurd enough; all choices by the pure will and whim of the people having their ears tickled by the demagogues, the blind and dumb owner of the ship being pleased by the sailors, who have attained such degree of perfection in their trickery by that very artificial selection their system caused in always

Having seen how that system of criterion by popularity rather than science is so detrimental let us see then what does that environment created by the democratic system favours and selects for.

What we have to first grasp about this critic is that rather than just a system where ‘people vote for a leader’ it is an ideology of freedom; that is the same spirit sported by the plebeians and by the lawless Athenians, and which was reborn on the Renaissance – the same critics for the mindless ‘freedom’ of the free market above, or to the ‘right of property’ as to the ‘human rights’, work for it, and indeed that free market is only possible on such lawless government where the mass of the people make all rules and define all prices¹⁵⁸.

selecting the most perfidious one – those ten commanders came back victorious, however there was a storm which killed many so that some surviving soldiers speak against them to the assembly of the people and the people decide to condemn the victorious commanders that they just voted for a few days ago to death.

The professional sailors and navigators are called to testify how it was impossible to sail around in a storm amid shipwrecks to save those people and how they were forced to flee to shore in order to not perish themselves besides being engaged in battle and not having that leisure to send out ships for that purpose; Socrates himself refused to even vote since it was impious due to religion observances of the proper date and procedure to perform such trials, but the maddened people threatened that any who tried to hinder the voting or who refused to comply in voting would suffer the same fate as the one they were to decree for the commanders – so that all authority bowed down to the brutal savagery of the ignorant mass as they were fuelled by emotions due to the account of the soldiers who nothing understood of navigation or government.

An eloquent orator, whoever, discoursed and won over the people to spare the commanders; what the truth and reality could not convince them to do – yet another orator did not like that so he went on convincing them of the opposite so that the people wanted to change their votes ending up with condemning the victorious commander to death.

Not long after they regretted what they had done in such rashness and against religious observance so that they asked the gods for forgiveness and passed on a vote against those who convinced them to kill the commanders; which successfully put to death those orators who made them vote against the commanders.

All this amid the grand Peloponnesian war; as Lysandros brought an end to the Golden Age of Greece conquering Athens he quickly set assassins to kill Alcibiades, who was far away in exile again as the people voted him out again, in order to deprive the people of any person still capable of rising Athens from servitude.

Or, as an earlier example, about the time Plato was being born the Athenians voted to kill all the men of Mytilene and sell all the women and children as slaves due to their revolt, but then another orator convinced them otherwise so that they had to send another ship that incurred the extreme risks and work of sailing day and night non-stop in order to get there in time to avoid the grand massacre as the first ship sent was carrying their previous order; that disastrous fickleness is the result of the incompetent and ignorant yielding power.

¹⁵⁸ Although funnily Malthus spoke against that catastrophic Napoleonic rampage that brought about the infection of democracy around the world.

“The great and unlooked for discoveries that have taken place of late years in natural philosophy; the increasing diffusion of general knowledge from the extension of the art of printing; the ardent and unshackled spirit of inquiry that prevails throughout the lettered, and even unlettered world; the new and extraordinary

lights that have been thrown on political subjects, which dazzle, and astonish the understanding; and particularly that tremendous phenomenon in the political horizon the French Revolution, which, like a blazing comet, seems destined either to inspire with fresh life and vigour, or to scorch up and destroy the shrinking inhabitants of the earth, have all concurred to lead many able men into the opinion, that we were touching on

So let us reconsider that argument about ‘who should yield power’ from a different angle; as for example when we look at some insectivorous plant.

Plants need to eat some photons in order to make their bodies; as its enzyme complexes hold down the carbon dioxide from the air in just the right way so that when the complex is hit by light it cascade it down to the correct strength to break the bonds of that molecule – building thus it into sugar rings from which it can then construct its body or break apart again by reacting with oxygen to create carbon dioxide releasing that energy back in order to perform some process in its metabolism.

Thus it is very beneficial for a plant to become taller; being in the shade of other plants will starve it to death and so the tallest plants survive to spread the genes – and growing some meters tall requires a really strong support, from which then we have so many different plants convergently developing the woody trunk and spreading leaves which we call ‘trees’.

That is not, however, the reason for plants to start feeding on insects; since while those carbohydrates are an amazing base material, they cannot do much without some nitrogen and phosphorus to form polar molecules capable of building structures – and thus long roots that can seek farther for such nutrients is very beneficial to plants; except if the soil is already rich and that extra cost of longer roots is wasted or if it is so poor that no rhizosphere can support the proteic and lipidic necessities of the plant.

To that end, then, it can be very beneficial to plants to use its anti-fungi capabilities to melt the chitin of the exoskeleton of arthropods; or rather they are so compeled by necessity as those unable to do so die and those most able to do so proliferate their offspring living on – so that on jungles, where contrasting with the rich biodiversity the soil is extremely poor as so many things are competing for it and water runs off with it, we observe time after time unrelated plants thus converging on that same strategy to fill that same niche.

As all become able to do it then the competition just goes on; those most able to attract them, by pretty colours or sweet or rotten smells, starve off those less apt just as those better able to trap its prey, by sticky leaves or moving mechanical contraptions, will fare better than the rest – so that from simple steps we arrive at the speciation from normal peaceful plants into these many kinds

a period big with the most important changes, changes that would in some measure be decisive of the future fate of mankind.

...

In a similar manner, the forcing manure used to bring about the French revolution, and to give a greater freedom and energy to the human mind, has burst the calyx of humanity, the restraining bond of all society; and, however large the separate petals have grown, however strongly, or even beautifully, a few of them have been marked, the whole is at present a loose, deformed, disjointed mass, without union, symmetry, or harmony of colouring.”

– An Essay on the Principle of Population I and XIV.

of unrelated insectivorous plants we observe today, a thing which mere existence was denied as an impossibility less than two centuries ago.

But then as we marvel ourselves watching some divine *drosera* with its sweet aroma wafting in the air and pink mucilage shining about we notice some crawling filthy going around it undisturbed; cleptomaniac maggots who explore the vulnerable who cannot defend himself while it eats for free the catches of the plant – since those who got trapped died, except those with any mutation that allowed them greater freedom so that as such trait was selected for it soon became beneficial to intentionally lay eggs on that deadly flower so that the immune maggots could be both protected and feed for free.

Ergo the plant created its own archi-enemy; but truly all other animals have likewise come from simple molecule that floating on warm ponds competed for the resources of copying themselves – merely the effects that invariable come from the causes around it.

From the ‘living beings’ to the rocks, environment and planet; all shaped by a quasi-invisible hand – and, of course, all human affairs are just part of that same process of the selection of the most stable lasting longer than the rest.

Now, do we laugh at the sore plight and at how ‘dumb’ the plant is for creating thus its archi-enemy? As we have seen there is no prescience of design in that selection just as the plant itself has no prescience, yet what can we say of us humans?

On simpler times men suffered much from their stronger and crasser diets; since what bulls and horses eat and is good for them is not good for us – so that we would today suffer exceedingly from eating those raw and pure things with no combination, but although people in the past used to it would suffer less they would still be subject to pain and diseases hastening their death. Thus only the stronger would survive while those of a weaker constitutions would perish; except those who then were compelled to seek other niches and more fitting food to their nature – so that if all food and drink were good to them they would have never invented Medicine, but by the necessity of taking care of illness they thus invented it and learnt how to wash, peel, grind, sift, mix and roast eventually creating bread.¹³⁹

¹³⁹ “Τὴν γὰρ ἀρχὴν οὐτ’ ἂν εὐρέθῃ ἡ τέχνη ἡ ἱητρικὴ οὐτ’ ἂν ἐζητήθῃ—οὐδὲν γὰρ αὐτῆς ἔδει-εἰ τοῖσι κάμνουσι τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὰ αὐτὰ διατρωμένοις τε καὶ προσφερομένοις, ἅπερ οἱ ὑγιαίνοντες ἐσθίουσί τε καὶ πίνουσι καὶ ἄλλα διατέονται, συνέφερον, καὶ μὴ ἦν ἕτερα τούτων βελτίω. νῦν δὲ αὐτὴ ἡ ἀνάγκη ἱητρικὴν ἐποίησεν ζητηθῆναι τε καὶ εὐρεθῆναι ἀνθρώποις, ὅτι τοῖσι κάμνουσι ταῦτα προσφερομένοις, ἅπερ οἱ ὑγιαίνοντες, οὐ συνέφερον, ὥς οὐδὲ νῦν συμφέρει. ἔτι δὲ ἄνωθεν ἔγωγε ἀξιώσας οὐδ’ ἂν τὴν τῶν ὑγιαίνοντων διαίταν τε καὶ τροφήν, ἣ νῦν χρέονται, εὐρεθῆναι, εἰ ἐξήρκει τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ταῦτα ἐσθιοντι καὶ πίνοντι βοῇ τε καὶ ἵππῳ καὶ πᾶσιν ἐκτὸς ἀνθρώπου, οἷον τὰ ἐκ τῆς γῆς φυόμενα, καρπούς τε καὶ ὕλην καὶ χόρτον. ἀπὸ τούτων γὰρ καὶ τρέφονται καὶ αὔξονται καὶ ἄποναι διάγουσιν οὐδὲν προσδέμενοι ἄλλης

As we observed then some insanely poisonous organisms, as penicillin, which can decimate other tiny organisms we promptly directed them at medicine; since diseases are caused by nothing more than the interference of the chemical pathways of the body, as when such tiny organisms colonize us – and so ingest that poison we got rid of them promptly without the need of millennia of evolution until developing some hard-coded poison of our own in our genes.

But of course some of those organisms survive; they happen to have some measure to evade the effects of the poison – and being the only survivors now they proliferate a new generation of harmful organisms that are immune to that medicine.

What do we do, then? Do we, as the prescient species we are, limit the usage of that only for the most necessary cases in order to not inutilize that amazing life-saving discovery?

Or do we just let people sell it for the lowest price they can, with just the cost of production, and so use it at their own discretion turning the medicine useless for the sake of relieving any discomfort they feel?

That would have been long the case already, but happen to be on some incomparable miraculous time in human history where we have not only that wonder drug, as never before we had and any scratch could be lethal, but can produce and find dozens of others that work quite the same way; yet as we throw our cocktails of many drugs at every bacteria they grow resistant to it – so that we

διαίτης. καὶ τοὶ τὴν γε ἀρχὴν ἔγωγε δοκέω καὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον τοιαύτῃ τροφῇ κεχρησθαι. τὰ δὲ νῦν διαιτήματα εὐρημένα καὶ τετεχνημένα ἐν πολλῷ χρόνῳ γεγενῆσθαι μοι δοκεῖ. ὥς γὰρ ἔπασχον πολλὰ τε καὶ δεινὰ ὑπὸ ἰσχυρῆς τε καὶ θηριώδους διαίτης ὥμα τε καὶ ἄκρητα καὶ μεγάλας δυνάμεις ἔχοντα ἐσπερόμενοι. οἶά περ ἂν καὶ νῦν ὑπ' αὐτῶν πάσχοιεν πόνοισι τε ἰσχυροῖσι καὶ νοῦσις περιπίπτοντες καὶ διὰ τάχους θανάτοις. ἦσσαν μὲν οὖν ταῦτα τότε εἰκὸς ἦν πάσχειν διὰ τὴν συνήθειαν, ἰσχυρῶς δὲ καὶ τότε. καὶ τοὺς μὲν πλείστους τε καὶ ἀσθενεστέραν φύσιν ἔχοντας ἀπόλλυσθαι εἰκός, τοὺς δὲ τούτων ὑπερέχοντας πλείω χρόνον ἀντέχειν: ὥσπερ καὶ νῦν ἀπὸ τῶν ἰσχυρῶν βρωμάτων οἱ μὲν ῥηϊδίως ἀπαλλάσσονται, οἱ δὲ μετὰ πολλῶν πόνων τε καὶ κακῶν. διὰ δὲ ταύτην τὴν αἰτίαν καὶ οὗτοί μοι δοκεῖσι ζητῆσαι τροφὴν ἀρμόζουσαν τῇ φύσει καὶ εὐρεῖν ταύτην, ἣ νῦν χρεώμεθα. ἐκ μὲν οὖν τῶν πυρῶν βρέξαντες σφας καὶ πίσαντες καὶ καταλέσαντες τε καὶ διασῆσαντες καὶ φορῦξαντες καὶ ὀπήσαντες ἀπετέλεσαν ἄρτον, ἐκ δὲ τῶν κριθέων μᾶζαν: ἄλλα τε πολλὰ περὶ ταῦτα πρηγματευσάμενοι ἤψησάν τε καὶ ὥπησαν καὶ ἔμιξαν, καὶ ἐκέρασαν τὰ ἰσχυρά τε καὶ ἄκρητα τοῖς ἀσθενεστέροις, πλάσσουντες πάντα πρὸς τὴν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου φύσιν τε καὶ δύναμιν, ἡγεύμενοι, ὅσα μὲν ἂν ἰσχυρότερα ἢ ἡ δυνήσεται κρατεῖν ἡ φύσις, ἢ ἐμφέρηται, ἀπὸ τούτων δ' αὐτῶν πόνους τε καὶ νοῦσους καὶ θανάτους ἐσσεσθαι, ὅπόσων δ' ἂν δύνηται ἐπικρατεῖν, ἀπὸ τούτων τροφὴν τε καὶ αὖξιν καὶ ὑγίειν. τῷ δὲ εὐρήματι τούτῳ καὶ ζητήματι τί ἂν τις ὄνομα δικαιότερον ἢ προσήκον μᾶλλον θείῃ ἢ ἡττηκῇ; ὅτι γε εὐρήται ἐπὶ τῇ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὑγίει τε καὶ σωτηρίῃ καὶ τροφῇ, ἀλλαγμὴ ἐκείνης τῆς διαίτης, ἐξ ἧς οἱ πόνοι καὶ νοῦσοι καὶ θάνατοι ἐγίνοντο.”

– Περί αρχαίας ιητρικῆς, About Archaic Medicine, III, where so unbelievably he thus describe some Natural Selection that lead to the development of human arts two mellenia before Robert.

are on this unwinnable race of finding ever more miracles against the immortal super-bug that we are selectively raising.

As the mindless plant so thus the acephalous mass of humankind, that could guarantee their future safety against diseases, is creating its biological archi-enemy; since both are equally lacking in any prescience.

The sale of such antibiotics is controlled to the lowest degree, requiring some simple authorization to buy one; which is clearly far from sufficient, yet what would happen to any president or party that advocates for strictly regulating that medicine?

How popular would he be on the public polls or on the senate?

That measure would be the right choice for securing a bright future for humankind, but as obvious instead of being praised and elected he would be promptly thrown away from power; while those who promise to relax regulations will be promptly elected – the tyranny of the masses would never choose to endure some little pain or discomfort when they have known the instant gratification of swallowing some magic pills that make the ache go away.

With not the slightest idea of how it works, but what he does know is that it makes him feel better and that he will bite whoever tries to take that away from him.

I have made mention of oil and its policy where people pay the extraction price of it, ignoring not only the externality of pollution but even that harm to the State in consuming its limited reserves of a resource; where could such absolutely deranged policy have risen? Would any be so stupid as to think that a good idea of a government?

Well, what will happen to the candidate to presidency who proposes to increase the price of oil to account for those factors?

We know who disastrously he would fare; and rather that politicians in time of crises pay subsidies in order to keep the price low and maintain the raving polulation happy – that policy, thus, is not any example of government nor even any crazy ideology, but merely the shameful measures that the demagogue sailors of the ship have used in order to persuade the blind and ignorant captain into electing them into power.

Thus that policy was not made to be any good, or bad, to the State or the people; how good or beneficial it is was never part of the consideration for it at all, but it was made as a necessity since without it he could not be elected – it is merely the optimal result that the environment selects for, and the benefit of the State is not part of the criteria of what Democracy selects for.

It does not select for any sound policy or what is beneficial to the present or future; it selects for what so ever, true or lie, best tickles the fancies of the masses – and the masses are more violent than tigers¹⁰⁰.

There are already super-bugs found every year and for a catastrophe to happen it needs only for one to become contagious; just as for decades that negligent geoengineering has been costing ten thousand times to the future of humankind as it gives as benefits right now – but all the governments can reasonably do is to laugh at it and pray for the calamity to come a little later instead of on their fours, or what else, years of power as spending resources that others will reap the benefits is unthinkable when he could use to boost his own position with immediate satisfaction.

The scientific study of species can, and invariably will, give us giant leaps in our medical treatments and it is literally unsustainable – not possible to sustain – the deforestation for the raising of cattle, but what president would be elected with the promises of making beef more expensive in order to account for that true cost to society and make it sustainable for the future so that the nation does not destroy itself?

Truly as Plato said; the threat of catastrophical difficulties seem to be distant in their future or only for others generations so that to them it seems tiny and insignificant while that meaningless immediate gratification is right before their eyes as if it was the greatest good they could ever have in life so that it takes all their field of view – which is further distorted by the twisted lenses of their biases.

Plato contrast gains in ‘this world’ against the superiority of a live of virtue with the gorgeous outburst that ‘Through the love of wealth we should make the whole of our time without leisure for other things that are not for the care of private property? The soul of each citizen depends of such and thus they should care of nothing that is not the daily pecuniary gain? And any learning or pursuit that leads at such each individual must be ready to study and practice, but should ridicule all the others? Is it without reason that any engages in a serious search of things honourable and excellent instead of through insatiable desire of silver and gold be disposed to undergo all art and artifice, no matter how beautiful or base, for the sake of wealth, no matter how holy or unholy, for even it being disgraceful they should not feel any annoyance if only they have the power, like wild beasts, to eat and drink all kinds of things and to obtain all satiety in all forms

¹⁰⁰ “孔子適齊，過泰山之側，有婦人哭於野者而哀。夫子式而聽之，曰：「此哀一似重有憂者。」使子貢往問之。而曰：「舅死於虎，吾夫又死焉，今吾子又死焉！」子貢曰：「何不去乎？」婦人曰：「無苛政。」子貢以告孔子。子曰：「小子識之！苛政猛於暴虎。」”

– 家語：正論解, Jiayu: Zheng Lun Jie, XIII, where thus Qiu finds a woman crying on the road so that asking the reason she informs him that her father was killed by a tiger besides that also her husband and now also her son, but upon being asked the reason for her not leaving such a place she then answers that there is no government there; to which Qiu tells his student to pay attention, that bad governments are more violent than tigers.

of venereal enjoyments?¹⁶¹, but on it we see a rather flawed critic; since we do not pursue ‘virtue’ or ‘save nature’ for some imaginary aim but for tangible and real results – it is only through ignorance that one fears, as the masses now do, the genetic engineering and other inevitable futures just as it is by their own stupidity that they think some cheaper meat or freedom to burn cheap fuel a greater benefit to them than that preservation of the monumental services nature provides us.

If we take a Tasmanian-devil we will find that its milk is a powerful antibiotic which can kill some of those bacteria that have become immune to what else we have; the famous penicillin itself is a simple fungus found by studying the mold that grew on a petri dish – meanwhile the oceans are deserts with its diversity of life concentrated on the rich coral reefs, on which we observe cetaceans brushing themselves against some specific corals which upon study we have found they release antibacterial substance.

How much literal value, in money, do each of those things have, besides uncountable benefits for the future of humankind?

Yet such medicines have not even begun to be used; how much more amazing for our future is the prospect of improving our medicine by understanding biologically immortal animals and those that can regenerate entire limbs, organs or reform their entire bodies – and, as we know well, we are having mass extinctions and collapse of coral reefs, losing those animals before we even have a chance of studying them.

The effect of that on the future of ours species is unspeakably catastrophic.

And what are we gaining from paying such steepest of prices?

We gain this meagre commodity of allowing individual to run their tons-heavy machines to move around rather than having an efficient transportation system in place.

¹⁶¹ “Τὴν μὲν ὑπ’ ἔρωτος πλούτου πάντα χρόνον ἄσכולον ποιούντος τῶν ἄλλων ἐπιμελεῖσθαι πλὴν τῶν ἰδίων κτημάτων, ἐξ ὧν κρεμαμένη πᾶσα ψυχὴ πολίτου παντός οὐκ ἂν ποτε δύναιτο τῶν ἄλλων ἐπιμέλειαν ἴσχειν πλὴν τοῦ καθ’ ἡμέραν κέρδους; καὶ ὅτι μὲν πρὸς τοῦτο φέρει μάθημα ἢ καὶ ἐπιτήδευμα, ἰδίᾳ πᾶς μανθάνειν τε καὶ ἀσκεῖν ἐτοιμώτατός ἐστιν, τῶν δὲ ἄλλων καταγελαῖ. τοῦτο μὲν ἐν καὶ ταύτην μίαν αἰτίαν χρῆ φάναι τοῦ μήτε τοῦτο μήτ’ ἄλλο μηδὲν καλὸν ἀγαθὸν ἐθέλειν ἐπιτήδευμα πόλιν σπουδάζειν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὴν τοῦ χρυσοῦ τε καὶ ἀργύρου ἀπληστίαν πᾶσαν μὲν τέχνην καὶ μηχανήν, καλλίω τε καὶ ἀσχημονεστέραν, ἐθέλειν ὑπομένειν πάντα ἄνδρα, εἰ μέλλει πλούσιος ἔσεσθαι, καὶ πρᾶξιν πράττειν ὅσιον τε καὶ ἀνόσιον καὶ πάντως αἰσχρὰν, μηδὲν δυσχεραίνοντα, ἐν μόνον ἔχῃ δύναμιν καθάπερ θηρίῳ τοῦ φαγεῖν παντοδαπὰ καὶ πιεῖν ὡσαύτως καὶ ἀφροδισίων πᾶσαν πάντως παρασχεῖν πλησμονήν.”

– Νόμοι, Laws, VIII: 831γ-831ε.

Fossil fuels derive their energy by taking long hydro-carbon molecules and exposing it to disturbance near oxygen; em sufficiently disturbed it reacts with oxygen to form carbon dioxide – which has less mass than the original products and that lost by becoming a more stable molecule is the ‘energy’ we get to move things.

That carbon dioxide in the air, then at due pressure diffusing more in the water, will react with that very water to produce carbonic acid, two hydrogen with one carbon and three oxygen, which easily loses its hydrogen to become double negative; and thus is perfect for attracting the double positive calcium atoms used on the metabolism of living things from all things, be it constructing their shells and skeletons to the activation of the synapses of their nerves – as the concentration of carbon dioxide increases, however, all those lost hydrogen floating around react back with some carbonate before calcium does preventing living things from getting that resource.

‘Acid’ means literally to have more free positive hydrogens on a solution; and perhaps it is easier to imagine how a more acid ocean is not a place fitting for living.

When we look for caves around the world we will find that almost all of them are ‘limestone caves’; why would that be?

As just seen it is due to the carbon reacting to such calcareous formations, which for the last few hundreds of millions of years have been formed mainly by the shell of marine animals; the falling rain carries carbon dioxide from the air, as released by the breathing of virtually all things and much more by us, and that same acid is formed to then corrode away the limestone as those calcium structure cannot compete with the power of the protons – the carbon trioxide formed by the dioxide with water is further hydrogenated rather than calcidid, digging thus holes kilometres deep into the earth until it meet some rock of different composition.

Companies have some immediate gain by selling their fuel and humankind enjoys burning it, but how much more would be gained by the research of those systems and how much more joy to be healthier; nature is truly, on the most literal economic sense, the most valuable good that humankind has – that rather soon for us right here, and how infinitely more of a no-brainer when we consider the future of our species, as it is what States have in view, that will have to deal with those calamities for our so tiny joy of burning and eating a little cheaper.

Companies only care about profits, as they should, and the free market allows that cancerous competition for the future detriment of all; it is the job of the government to regulate them so that they do not sell our future, which is a public property, in exchange for this momentary gain of private property – to protect the public good are the economic laws enacted in order to receive the due price of externalities that make it sustainable.

But then having a worse-than-worthless government leads us to our current global situation; as the masses are stupid and will not choose anything but the immediate gratification – as blind and lacking in prescience as Natural Selection, it does not select for any future good.

That is, it cannot elect those qualified for the government; but much the otherwise.

Let us take a look again at how to conduct agriculture; a very popular practice, once thought to even have been the cause of the collapse of the Maia civilization, is that of slash-and-burn – which name quite well explains the general idea of it.

Plants are built from those nutrients they took and if you just cut it all down and set it on fire it will let out a little portion of those nutrients; which will make a quite fertile field – at least for some two or three seasons before reverting to a desolate unsustainable plot of land since rain forests, with all the rain and competition for resources, holds no store of nutrients on the soil.

From our previous mention of how valuable the study of new species are it is obvious how infinitely detrimental it is to thus extinct them for a few seasons of crops, but perhaps it gets worse when we consider what will happen to that field – and what happens to all the others – if it is not thus abandoned; as it will be feed by the most unsustainable artificial fertilizers.

When I was born, little more than two decades ago, humankind was two billion people smaller; and when my father was born, little more than two decades before me, humankind also was two billion people smaller from what it would be two decades later – that is, it was half the current eight billion when he was born in the seventies.

The food which sustains me, him and most of human population was then produced by that very artificial fertilizer with the chemical process discovered just last century about how to extract the nitrogen from atmosphere; the precious atom that turns hydrocarbon into ‘proteins’ used in the structure and mechanisms of all living beings – truly a wonderful tool that so greatly helped humankind.

Yet, what happens if that fertilizer, with the combination of phosphorus and other such nutrients, go where they should not; as a wild environment? It disturbs them and inevitably ends up in the water flowing out to lakes and the ocean; where algae thus bloom happily at such flood of nutrients, blocking the very sun from reaching the creatures below as also consuming all other resources in the water since those more important ones are no longer the limiting reagent – until then they inevitably die in mass which massive decomposition force the bacteria to consume all the oxygen diffused on the water thus killing everything alive there that managed to survive the previous sunless and nutrient-deprived waters.

Those giant dead-zones taking entire lakes or on the sea are very common nowadays and receive the pretty name of ‘algal bloom’; a needless damage create by more than just the carelessness in storing that fertilizer – but by the very practice of agriculture since that now desolate field, a giant

monoculture devoid of trees whose roots hold the soil and protect against the erosion of water and wind, cannot possibly hold those nutrients dumped over it.

And so it is all washed away; and much easier and cheaper it is for the farmer to simply dump more every time – since it is the world who pays the price of that biological catastrophe and he would also gain nothing by going through the trouble of avoiding that calamity, but rather would be run out of business by those that abusing the cheaper method profit more.

The soil is rather a biome itself which, in natural environments, have a large diversity of plants that on their roots, their rhizosphere, cultivate bacteria that thus perform those functions of absorbing nutrients from the atmosphere and forming more soil itself; a deeper soil which water can then penetrate to be stored rather than carrying away the fertilizers and which system then can hold worms and all kinds of other living things that store nutrients on their very bodies as part of the natural cycles – but how much simpler and how much more private gain, although detriment to the public, can be found by destroying that natural cycle entirely to just flood it with water and nutrients non-stop.

The fungi present on natural soils are the very brain and bodies of ecosystems; the mycelia receive sugars from the plants and returns back nutrients to them so that it is on its best interest to redistribute to the plants that need it more, mitigating the effect of the random distribution of every resources be it light or water and salts, while when there is any attack the plants release chemicals for their defense which will be shared by the fungi and triggered on all plants before they themselves are attacked – so do exposition to kinds and levels of light, temperature and nutrients provoke different responses on the plants, and which response is coordinated by the fungi so they they can all soften and harden at their due part in their trophism in answer to any other condition they face.

Truly as neutrons judging the conditions and forming the resilient ecosystem which colonized dry land and still dominates over it to this day.

On the other hand our monocultural nutrient-duping practices over wasted lands has no future, but rather flirts endlessly with catastrophe.

Our own future, perfectly linked to that of the environments around us, is as messed up as that soil; even if we entirely stop shoving carbon dioxide on the atmosphere, which is the most famous problem, and further fix our farming habits with so many other awful choices we make, that would still not be enough – as we have seen before each ecosystem has its self-regulating mechanisms, but if perturbed too far it can no longer recover to its previous position.

So too have we passed the limit of the stress ecosystems can take and entered the negative spiral loop for the collapse of many; and the fall of one cog only makes it harder for the remaining ones to avoid collapsing too in a complete disaster – it will not, likely, extinct us with our current

measures, but rather than building a glorious future our choices are leading us to some awful times.

Like a cart or a table which holds up to two hundred kilograms; we can put twenty or two hundred and it sustains such difference of a hundred and eighty without any trouble, but if we put two hundred and twenty, only more twenty, it breaks; and even without reaching such point of immediate critical failure putting two hundred and five or two hundred and twenty it is already above its plasticity in holding without damage so that it will deteriorate eventually failing too.

As swinging oneself in a chair where with impunity we move many angles and it continues falling back towards the front, but on the moment that our centre of mass passes the supporting legs so that it goes to the other side then it will fall only backwards and no longer towards the front; even if we traverse one thousandth of an angle it will slowly, and accelerating, fall in such direction.

For long nature has been like that and without us rebuilding the pillars that allow it to regenerate then it will continue only degrading until the catastrophe on the same way.

Snow is able to form glacial mountains for upon it falling it starts to melt, however if more fall upon it before it melts entirely then it is the other one that will have to melt entirely before the one below it; and so while the rate of falling is greater than that of melting it will continue piling upon the others crushing them into immense Bergs of Eis.

Changing the temperature even in several degrees will only affect how fast they grow and their maximum size, but on the moment that a fraction of a degree breaks the barrier where the melting is greater than that of piling then it is no longer possible to exist the biome – when we begin to see the glaciers melting instead of growing we know that the temperature has passed the limit and they will only continue melting until they no longer exist.

And the world is in cycles with each change affecting the rest of it so that less white area exposes the darker sea or land below, changes the albedo of the planet, making the temperature rise even further; what obviously accelerates the melting of the glaciers themselves, but also increase further the effect of greenhouse since forest fires being more common more material is released on the atmosphere while other processes of melting against freezing, as the ground water against permafrost which on the land is where most part of the carbon is trapped not allowing decomposition on the frozen ground, releasing what was frozen pushing even further on the direction of warming – and as I described the ocean acidification I might as well go about how exactly carbon heats the planet and what is a ‘greenhouse gas’.

If we heat up a piece of metal, or anything, to seven hundred degrees it will glow ‘red hot’; thus too the sun is just hotter so that it lets out light more energetic than the red one – and so too the planet releases energy below the red spectrum as we can easily see, with fitting instruments since our eyes are not so, being emitted from all bodies. But since it has such frequency such interacts

strongly with molecules of that certain sizes, like even weaker microwaves heating water but not the glass directly as we see by the cold plate or the cool plasma we get when putting a grape or something else that has the right wavelength length, so that the composites of carbon floating in the atmosphere have that size where they interact and absorb that light partly preventing the Earth from dissipating heat by radiation to space – while the sun rays, being of more powerful waves and tinier waves, enter through not interacting withal.

If some meteor, as the putative Eltanin, or some massive volcanic eruption were to trigger a global winter with the atmospheric dust blocking solar light, so that we have a pause from global warming, it would help us very little; not only because of all the other effects of that, but because treating the symptoms is far from dealing with the true disease – which are the impossibility to sustain our current practices.

Our focus on ‘temperature’ is from how obvious the effects from it are; since it alters all processes that happen on the planet in turn altering the composition of the very wrong from what is advantageous to life to what is poisonous; as our very atmosphere is the third we had, and the only one that can sustain complex life as we know, and changes in the parameters of the world would give us some world-ending fourth version of it – or more immediately how storms are much more brutal and how the rise in sea level, with half the world population living near the coastline, are already causing calamities to humankind itself all around the world.

The very fresh water from the melting of glaciers on the ocean is a poison reaching the tipping point of many species and biomes, as corals, which are not able to live outside stable levels of salinity, acidity, temperature and other infinity of parameters; where the fall of one biome condemns then yet others which require the products of that one to survive, from food to environmental conditions, for all, including the terrestrial ones too naturally, have links with the exchange of resources and cycles with the entire planet – and the sweet water still by itself being less dense than the salty one it stays on the surface for a time before mixing where such separatory layer begins to move independently over the sea isolating it from the air leading to a change of oceanic currents which on their turns define the climate of the planet so that the entire globe together passing of its stability point where those biomes that prospered before now only degenerate.

For long we have already been plastically deforming all such environments and we observe their gradual decline; it is not such change to a second derivative, an acceleration, that is negative that we have ahead but the tipping point left now is the critical failure and sudden collapse of such – such environments under stress approach the limit of their elasticity where the rope snaps and as the permafrost that they melt we can easily predict that as volcanoes the pressure of the gas will continue to accumulate until it is superior to the resistance of the earth above leading to explosive eruptions, so too the so near failure of systems is a violent processes with no turning back which destroys its surroundings together with it.

Corals, the forest of marine biodiversity, are so fragile that the fresh water of storms not rarely disturbs enough the equilibrium of their ecosystem that they die; how much more their destruction in massive scale already so well known on this absolute global chaos.

The entire rest of the immense limitless oceans are a tedious waste; a desert of water – and then how strong would it be the repercussion of the fall of such richest marine ecosystem?

The masses can no longer claim perfect ignorance, but their stupidity and limited capacity of reasoning any series of consequences creates such absolute negligence and underestimation of how much catastrophe is already inevitable – and yet instead of alleviating it our modern system merely forges on sinking us further into disaster.

Is not the legendary cradle of the Fertile Crescent composed of Mesopotamia lulled by the whimsical Euphrates and Tigris and of Egypt, which all know that Khmer is a gift from the Nile; that Chine suckled on Huang and India the fruits of Ganges – and Mesoamerica the lakes of Coatzacoalcos while the masters of the Cordillera began from Sechín before sculpting the Andes with their terraces straight from the source? It is well known the factoid that every civilization begins thus at the margin of rivers, but then accepting it without thinking they do not question why do rivers seem to be so magically fertile as if blessed by the gods – and therefore that without its nutritive alluvial deposit of minerals the rivers would produce nothing, as dams destroy the life of the rest of the river and we see the endless geopolitical discussions about the rights of such.

And not less important are the rivers of elastic fluid carrying such sediments as nutritive dust which feeds the concentrated fertility of such inelastic rivers or directly the forest be it as clouds of nutritive dust or as real clouds of rain for just as water at zero degrees does not begin freezing until there is a nucleation site so too the clouds do not form without such particles, of dust or of common planktonic gas, as site for nucleation for the loose elastic vapour to condensate; all of which at the end discharges on the immense Celestial-Pond where are gathered all the salty minerals of the ceaseless erosion of the planet – and which maritime currents creates its own oceanic biomes and so it is Ocean the great lord who controls all fertility and who determinates the entire climate where and how it rains, how the wind blows and what lives and grows or wither and dies. And his judgement is changing to one different from the world we know; and to one that is not in our favour.

How could someone imagine that the gigantic forests are not the product of such fertility and that they do not depend thus of the equilibrium of the current conditions? As if the gods had made everything changeless on the exact form we see today? For thus the marine currents, for example, discharge on the Amazon Basin there at our north teragrams of mineral shells only from diatoms which are the fruits of such oceanic biota; how much more of every other nutrient and thus how strongly such massive forest depends of such favourable current and oceanic productions of nutrients on its basin – while through the sky the particulates of dust from the Sahara deposit crucial elements which are in equal constancy taken away by the rain and rivers.

It was such miraculous set of innumerable conditions that allowed something so phenomenal to grow; and on different conditions all that awaits such ecosystem is the incapacity of sustaining it – total collapse before its own greatness.

We disturb then such sea current and on the same way the air ones will change; where the withering of the former ‘lung of the world’ is just one factor amid the domino effect on every ecosystem changing radically – with floods where it was dry and drought where it was flooded and so those that need water die of thirst and those who do not support it are drowned.

The Amazon has not always existed; and it suffices to pass our eyes over the natural history of such last dozens of millions of years since its flourishing to see that human civilization, with the greatest of misery and suffering ever suffered by our species, will have to rebuild everything it has already made to adapt to such different world.

We were doing much more than warming the globe but we changed the composition of atmosphere itself, changing the climate, unchaining such chain reactions simultaneously around the world; long past the plastic point where it would recover by itself.

In Portuguese there is an expression that says ‘to plant tamars’.

That is all the expression says; or the saying ‘who plants tamars do not harvest tamars’ – and so who hears it naturally rather confused asks ‘How so?’, where then whoever used the expression begins to flex his wisdom and mythical biological knowledge of some said tree of such name that takes a hundred eyes after planted to give fruits.

Thus who plants one never tastes of its fruits, but today we have tamars and eat of it for they planted it on the past; and we plant them for our sons and grandsons.

Thus planting tamars is a horrible personal investment; we are spending our resources with something that does not bring any benefit to us – we work to give to others and we open our hand of comfort for the sake of others.

It is an appalling strategy if our goal is to have to us the most pleasant life possible.

But it is not by pure egotism that we humans avoid such altruism, but that we not give ourselves the trouble of thinking to even get to the conclusion of how we want to live and about which is the best strategy to reach such goal; it is both by ignorance as by laziness without thinking on the future that we never open our hand letting go of some little comfort now for the sake of something that most cannot even understand – for, once again, we do not give ourselves the trouble of thinking to decide if they want to be immoral villains or to seek virtue.

That is; devoid of all intellect and reason the masses can only choose that which is most pleasant for them immediately – they err thinking that the grain of barley before their eyes is greater than

the mountains of Erebus belching smoke decades ahead, and so too they abuse blind Plutus as Panacea sleeps with none other to save us from our misery.

The only purpose of the government is to regulate such actions in society for the sake of posterity and of all rather than individual gain, however the ‘government’ elect by the people will only represent the immediate reward that they want; thus no one stops cutting trees thinking in how they descendants will not be able to live on a desolated land because they are too busy and drunk cutting them to make more of their bonfire parties.

I blamed out current ecological disaster on Democracy earlier, which might have been a little perplexing at first, but my meaning should be clear by now.

All these problems, of health and the energy of fuel and food, seem rather unrelated and to entirely different areas of science, but they all stem from a single cause; that having Power, the capacity and ability, to change the world is a blessing, but also that all this evil comes from those unqualified wilding that Power – so that it is worthless to treat the symptoms as if they were the cause, since the true problem is not that obvious and intrusive stain on the surface of the water but what is below on the deeply seated causes of the impurity which pollutes the source and thus render turbid the entire stream of human life¹⁰².

Now, that is Democracy, but to make my meaning yet clearer I will then attack the grand argument that is used to defend it; which is truly no argument and of no value at all, but a mere norm – which is that of ‘freedom’, that ‘people should have freedom’ and somehow ‘that freedom is worth more than some little benefits that we might get otherwise’.

The mystical benefit of the second line can be promptly dismissed by all rant we have gone through against normatism; as what measure is that he may use to judge that gain to be insignificant or little – and then what else would we judge for, if not for the system that thus give us a greater benefit?

I used to answer that to a friend of mine by saying ‘There can be no freedom to allow a child to eat as much sweets as he will; since it is only through ignorance that he thinks that sweets do him good.’; which my friend would always reply ‘You always say that and it does not even make sense; everyone is an adult!’ and I would go on saying on how he simply was too dumb to understand my words.

¹⁰² “Yet, in reality, they are light and superficial, they are mere feathers that float on the surface, in comparison with those deeper seated causes of impurity that corrupt the springs, and render turbid the whole stream of human life.”

– An Essay on the Principle of Population X, although he uses that against the critic of governments in general as proposed by the mindless of anarchy.

You may refer back to my dialogue on the beginning, but the repetition of the argument now with another Platonic question is about if all are equally competent and knowledgeable to judge the best course; or if candy is not good.

Most would answer that candy is good 'but too much is bad for you'; and would understand that I am hinting about too much freedom also being bad.

Yet I am not saying that 'too much candy' is the evil thing; rather that evil is caused by the power that he has in wrongfully using the candy – not on the candy, or power itself, but on him being unfit to wield that power.

Plato would often ask things on the lines that 'Is Wealth good?'.

And the opposing party would often reply either a straight 'yes' or the smart answer that 'it is better to be rich than to be poor'.

To which he proceeds asking 'Is Poverty bad then? Or can it be good for someone to be poor?'.

Which later is readily denied saying that there cannot be any goodness in Poverty; allowing him to go on with his reasoning that thus Wealth must benefit who has it, and Poverty must be harmful to those who have it – and that it cannot be otherwise.

On the puzzling of how Wealth can be bad then some reach the question of how bandits can kill him to get that Wealth or kidnap his family since he is rich; and all such worries of Wealth that the poor man is free thereof.

But Plato goes further saying that the Wealth man would ruin himself with his own Wealth; as by desiring the wife of his neighbor¹⁶³. Being poor would be to him a benefit as he would be unable to attain that wish, as she might like luxuries and gifts, and his evil desire would not go beyond a fantasy; keeping his job, his good wife and his friendly neighbour – yet, by having the power to carry out his evil, he would lose all that no longer contributing to society with his job, losing his good wife and might getting himself killed by having an affair with the wife of his neighbour.

He is destroyed by his Wealth; naturally it is not the fault of money, but his own – of money in the wrong hands that are unfit to wield that power.

As the children whose good parents hinder him from having all he wants for they know that would be worse for him; just as diabetics and hypertensive people who should not eat and drink many things, but having no self-control they would cause a great evil to themselves in case their family did not take away their freedom so that losing such freedom is to them a blessing

¹⁶³ That exact example is not from him, however, but a pseudo-Plato dialogue.

regardless of them liking it or not on their ignorant opinion – like children hating their parents for not allowing them to pet the lion on the zoo or to frolick eternally without fulfilling their duties.

And so on any other ten thousand examples that can be inferred from ‘wealth’ or ‘authority’ which are just other names for the abstract of ‘power’; which instead of being inherently good it is only an intensifier of what his wisdom, or foolishness, brings to himself.

On the courtroom of children the doctor with his bitter medicine is condemned and no matter what is said to the ignorant ones he will never have any chance against the sweets of the confectioner; for if the medic cut them, in surgery, burnt them, with alcohol to cauterize, pierced them, with vaccines, made them drink bitter concoctions and forced them to starvation and thirst in fasting how would they ever believe that such wants them well and not the baker who with so many pleasures seduce them?¹⁶⁴

Neither is medicine ‘absolutely good’; but only to those who are sick and who need that specific treatment – as only someone qualified can distinguish if the treatment who heals one will actually also heal another or be bad on that other case.¹⁶⁵

¹⁶⁴ “ὁ αὐτὸς δέ μοι ἤκει λόγος ὄνπερ πρὸς Πῶλον ἔλεγον· κρινοῦμαι γὰρ ὡς ἐν παιδίῳ ἱατρὸς ἂν κρίνοιτο κατηγοροῦντος ὁμοιοῦ. σκόπει γάρ, τί ἂν ἀπολογοίτο ὁ τοιοῦτος ἄνθρωπος ἐν τούτοις ληφθείς, εἰ αὐτοῦ κατηγοροῖ τις λέγων ὅτι ‘ὦ παῖδες, πολλὰ ὑμᾶς καὶ κακὰ ὁδε εἴργασται ἀνὴρ καὶ αὐτοὺς, καὶ τοὺς νεωτάτους ὑμῶν διαφθείρει τέμνων τε καὶ κάων, καὶ ἴσχναίνων καὶ πνίγων ἀπορεῖν ποιεῖ, πικρότατα πώματα διδοὺς καὶ πεινῆν καὶ διψῆν ἀναγκάζων, οὐχ ὥσπερ ἐγὼ πολλὰ καὶ ἡδέα καὶ παντοδαπὰ ἡυόχουν ὑμᾶς’ τί ἂν οἶε ἐν τούτῳ τῷ κακῷ ἀποληφθέντα ἱατρὸν ἔχειν εἰπεῖν; ἢ εἰ εἴποι τὴν ἀλήθειαν, ὅτι ‘ταῦτα πάντα ἐγὼ ἐποίουν, ὦ παῖδες, ὑγιεινῶς,’ πόσον τι οἶε ἂν ἀναβοῆσαι τοὺς τοιοῦτους δικαστάς; οὐ μέγα;” – Γοργίας, Gorgias, 521e-522a, which critic on the specific scenery of a tribunal hints at the death of Socrates himself; as saying the displeasing truth rather than pleasant lies.

¹⁶⁵ “Τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ τρόπον σκεπτέον καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ κατὰ τι καὶ ποτὲ καὶ πού· εἰ γὰρ κατὰ τι ἐνδέχεται, καὶ ἀπλῶς ἐνδέχεται· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τὸ ποτὲ ἢ πού· τὸ γὰρ ἀπλῶς ἀδύνατον οὔτε κατὰ τι οὔτε ποτὲ οὔτε πού ἐνδέχεται. (Ἐνστασις ὅτι κατὰ τι μὲν εἰσι φύσει σπουδαῖοι, οἷον ἐλευθέριοι ἢ σωφρονικοί, ἀπλῶς δὲ οὐκ εἰσι φύσει σπουδαῖοι. Ὅμοιος δὲ καὶ ποτὲ μὲν ἐνδέχεται τῶν φθαρτῶν τι μὴ φθαρῆναι, ἀπλῶς δ’ οὐκ ἐνδέχεται μὴ φθαρῆναι. Τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ τρόπον καὶ πού μὲν συμφέρει τοιαύτη διαίτη χρῆσθαι, οἷον ἐν τοῖς νοσώδεσι τόποις, ἀπλῶς δ’ οὐ συμφέρει. Ἐτι δὲ πού μὲν ἓνα μόνον δυνατόν εἶναι, ἀπλῶς δὲ οὐ δυνατόν ἓνα μόνον εἶναι. Τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ τρόπον καὶ πού μὲν καλὸν τὸν πατέρα θύειν, οἷον ἐν Τριβαλλοῖς, ἀπλῶς δ’ οὐ καλόν. Ἡ τοῦτο μὲν οὐ πού σημαίνει ἀλλὰ τισὶν· οὐδὲν γὰρ διαφέρει ὅπου ἂν ᾧσιν· πανταχοῦ γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἔσται καλόν, οὔσι Τριβαλλοῖς. Πάλιν ποτὲ μὲν συμφέρει φαρμακεύεσθαι, οἷον ὅταν νοσῇ, ἀπλῶς δ’ οὔ. Ἡ οὐδὲ τοῦτο ποτὲ σημαίνει ἀλλὰ τῷ διακειμένῳ πως· οὐδὲν γὰρ διαφέρει ὅποτεοῦν, ἐὰν οὕτω μόνον διακείμενος ᾦ.) Τὸ δ’ ἀπλῶς ἐστὶν ὁ μηδενὸς προστεθέντος ἑρεῖς ὅτι καλόν ἐστὶν ἢ τὸ ἐναντίον· οἷον τὸ τὸν πατέρα θύειν οὐκ ἑρεῖς καλὸν εἶναι ἀλλὰ τισὶ καλὸν εἶναι· οὐκ ἄρα ἀπλῶς καλόν· ἀλλὰ τὸ τοὺς θεοὺς τιμᾶν ἑρεῖς καλὸν οὐδὲν προσθείς· ἀπλῶς γὰρ καλόν ἐστὶν. Ὡστε ὁ ἂν μηδενὸς προστιθεμένου δοκῇ εἶναι καλὸν ἢ αἰσχρὸν ἢ ἄλλο τι τῶν τοιούτων, ἀπλῶς ῥηθήσεται.”

– Τοπικά, Topics, II: 11: 4, Aristotle so goes on against the variation and impermanence of certain characteristics; as that of ‘absolute good’ since what is good to one may not be to another.

Or are not tyrants, used to having everything, those who most suffer fighting against their own dispositions for it is only with the greatest difficulty that they change their passions?

Which to most is an alien suffering; a difficulty that seems like paradise to those who only see themselves desiring the ever-greener lawn of their neighbours.

Excess of power five more authority than is convenient; and much more commonly instead of any raging demon they are the ones who are the ruin of the patrimony of their own lives and all they know – how infinitely better then it is to mortals the moderation and due measure so that before any megalomania they have safety to grow old well.¹⁶⁶

Just so is the capacity of being able not only useless, but a prejudice, to who has no self-control, that is the lack of wisdom and knowledge to use it well, for he has the power to cause damage to himself by means of ignorance so that it is beneficial to him to not have more authority than what is to him due; power without prudence is an evil¹⁶⁷ – and who is more ignorant and imprudent than the masses?

So that the power invested over then only causes their own ruin to the detriment of all.

To throw dice and choose by luck who rules would be something wiser for there would not be such unilateral pressure to the corrupt and deceitful strategy which is selected in charming the vote of the masses and politic allies.

¹⁶⁶ “δεινὰ τυράννων λήματα καὶ πῶς
ὀλίγ’ ἀρχόμενοι, πολλὰ κρατοῦντες
χαλεπῶς ὀργὰς μεταβάλλουσιν.
τὸ γὰρ εἰθίσθαι ζῆν ἐπ’ ἴσοισιν
κρεῖσσον· ἐμοὶ γοῦν ἐν μὴ μεγάλοις
ὀχυρῶς γ’ εἴη καταγῆράσκειν.
τῶν γὰρ μετρίων πρῶτα μὲν εἰπεῖν
τοῦνομα νικᾶ, χρῆσθαι τε μακρῷ
λῶστα βροτοῖσιν· τὰ δ’ ὑπερβάλλοντ’
οὐδένα καιρὸν δύναται θνητοῖς·
μείζους δ’ ἄτας, ὅταν ὀργισθῇ
δαίμων οἴκοις, ἀπέδωκεν.”
– Μήδεια, Medea, 119-130.

¹⁶⁷ “Καὶ εἰ τόδε μὲν ἄνευ τοῦδε αἰρετόν, τόδε δὲ ἄνευ τοῦδε μή· οἷον δύναμις ἄνευ φρονήσεως οὐχ αἰρετόν, φρόνησις δ’ ἄνευ δυνάμεως αἰρετόν.”

– Τοπικά, Topics, III: 3: 23, where Aristotle uses such example to stablish the relation of what is more precious; that ‘power without wisdom is not desirable, but wisdom even without power is’.

At such attack at the incapacity of the masses to choose we often meet then with the reply that ‘it suffices to teach them then’.

But what should we teach? Teach them how to vote? Or how biology works and how they should be responsible with the antibiotics?

Both things might be said to be important; so let us put them all in a school and then democratically decide by vote what they will watch – what will be the result of that democracy?

Will they vote for that which they have to use their brains and suffer to learn things; will they vote on that which is inconvenient to them telling them what they do not want to hear about how their comfort is bad to the world?

Or will they vote to watch animated cartoons and the popular acephalous TV shows?

My friend answered me that ‘But many people like channels about nature and learning about climate too’.

To which I replied that was a true assertion, but how did that answer my question? What does that assertion supports as a proof thereof?

He was then ashamed to further answer; since that experiment had already been done on the school of the world where the internet allow all, with access to it, to then choose what they want to buy with their time – and as all know it is not the said educational and useful channels that are on the popular posters throughout town or adorning the top rank of the streaming services.

Thus even that proposed ‘teach them’ is already presupposing some absolute leader deciding what they should learn and forcing them to do so because they do not want it; his assertion about those model humans who should be imitated referred rather to the one percent, but ninety nine per cent of the power are in the hand of those worthless ones – so that his own argument, or rather his random assertion since that is no argument, proposes that the one percent should rule over the ninety nine.

And truly as long as the majority is vile the result worsens the more of them partakes of the vote.¹⁶⁸

Or has it not always been obvious that the life that men lead is on most part of the most vulgar kind identifying Happiness with immediate pleasure? For before a division between such, a

¹⁶⁸ A simple mathematical truth, shown by Concorcet, and it is absurd who Aristotle for a moment falls into dementia in saying that the crowd are the best judges since somehow they magically balance out and ‘fill in for each others lack of skill’ producing the best result; what is simply an acephalous thing to say going against even the simplest math.

political life and a contemplative one it is evident to all that the masses of humankind are slaves to their tastes preferring a life fitting only to wild beasts; even so while they identify Happiness with living well and being well they still disagree amongst themselves if such means the direct physical pleasure or wealth or honours – and the same man gives different answers at different times for when he is ill he says that Happiness is health and when poor he says it is wealth. And all such, consciously or not, admire the one that they think to be wise proclaiming some grandiose ideal beyond their comprehension. Ergo infinitely far from such is the capacity to consider what truly is the universal good and so it is pure detriment for them to have the power of vote asking them their ignorant opinions about what is the path to Happiness.¹⁶⁹

That is, when someone goes out killing others or stealing people does anyone talk about respecting his freedom of doing such things?

No one is free to litter or defecate wherever they please either; the inconvenience of them in having to hold it up to where they are allowed to do it and all of the kind are shows of how the limited liberty is what even allow society to exist.

Is that some ‘exception’ to that mindless renaissance rule of ‘liberty’? As said many times; a ‘rule’ has no exceptions – and one instead points to the true rule that seamlessly rules over both cases.

And the answer is exactly the same as before about the ‘liberty of free market’; when the liberty of any one is bad for the rest of the world it has to be promptly restricted – and how perfectly insignificant is the evil caused by the odious odour, visual offense, mess on shoes and tires and the

¹⁶⁹ “Λέγωμεν δ’ ἀναλαβόντες, ἐπειδὴ πᾶσα γνῶσις καὶ προαίρεσις ἀγαθοῦ τινὸς ὀρέγεται, τί ἐστὶν οὗ λέγωμεν τὴν πολιτικὴν ἐφίεσθαι καὶ τί τὸ πάντων ἀκρότατον τῶν πρακτῶν ἀγαθόν. ὀνόματι μὲν οὖν σχεδὸν ὑπὸ τῶν πλείστων ὁμολογεῖται· τὴν γὰρ εὐδαιμονίαν καὶ οἱ πολλοὶ καὶ οἱ χαρίεντες λέγουσιν, τὸ δ’ εὖ ζῆν καὶ τὸ εὖ πράττειν ταῦτον ὑπολαμβάνουσι τῷ εὐδαιμονεῖν· περὶ δὲ τῆς εὐδαιμονίας, τί ἐστίν, ἀμφισβητοῦσι καὶ οὐχ ὁμοίως οἱ πολλοὶ τοῖς σοφοῖς ἀποδιδοῦσιν. οἱ μὲν γὰρ τῶν ἐναργῶν τι καὶ φανερῶν, οἷον ἡδονὴν ἢ πλοῦτον ἢ τιμὴν, ἄλλοι δ’ ἄλλο–πολλάκις δὲ καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς ἕτερον· νοσήσας μὲν γὰρ ὑγίειαν, πενόμενος δὲ πλοῦτον· συνειδότες δ’ ἑαυτοῖς ἄγνοιαν τοὺς μέγα τι καὶ ὑπὲρ αὐτοὺς λέγοντας θαυμάζουσιν. Ἡμεῖς δὲ λέγωμεν ὅθεν παρεξέβημεν. τὸ γὰρ ἀγαθὸν καὶ τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν οὐκ ἁλόγως εἰκάσιν ἐκ τῶν βίων ὑπολαμβάνειν οἱ μὲν πολλοὶ καὶ φορτικώτατοι τὴν ἡδονήν· διὸ καὶ τὸν βίον ἀγαπῶσι τὸν ἀπολαυστικόν. τρεῖς γάρ εἰσι μάλιστα οἱ προύχοντες, ὃ τε νῦν εἰρημένος καὶ ὁ πολιτικὸς καὶ τρίτος ὁ θεωρητικὸς. Τὸ δὲ καθόλου βέλτιον ἴσως ἐπισκέπασθαι καὶ διαπορῆσαι πῶς λέγεται, καίπερ προσάντους τῆς τοιαύτης ζητήσεως γινομένης διὰ τὸ φίλους ἄνδρας εἰσαγαγεῖν τὰ εἶδη. δόξειε δ’ ἂν ἴσως βέλτιον εἶναι καὶ δεῖν ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ γε τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ τὰ οἰκεία ἀναιρεῖν, ἄλλως τε καὶ φιλοσόφους ὄντας· ἀμφοῖν γὰρ ὄντων φίλον ὅσιον προτιμᾶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν.”

– *Ηθικά Νικομάχεια*, *Nicomachean Ethics*, I, which is another wonderful burn from Aristotle; although his own system of government is so worthless I have not gone over that pure normative meaningless collection of what he imagines to be ‘virtues to be cultivated by the government’.

diseases caused by that faeces in public if compared with the infinitely greater injury caused by the worse-than-worthless jury of the masses being free to rule themselves.

It is nothing revolutionary, but as before I provide the model which explains and justify those laws; rather than by any imaginary goal of some normative ‘right of freedom’¹⁷⁰.

Truly that ‘free market’ can only exist if the people too are free to govern themselves, either in democracy or anarchy, and how blind of Malthus to criticize one while upholding the other; that ‘economic freedom’ is the product of the degenerated mind of extreme democracy which so confused the idea that ‘freedom’ is having the impunity to do what so ever one wills – they think doing what so ever they will is what is best for them, and the laws of government that so saves and protects them they rather think oppressive.¹⁷¹

Thus it is my long repeated argument; merely attacking another baseless and detrimental norm which seeking purely imaginary aims produces only misery – in this case that of ‘freedom to vote’, Democracy.

To obtain office they know very well that it suffices to give many gifts; to the people part of the diverted resources and sweet words and to their companions more of the resources and favours – without such it is as using a cat as bait for a rat and try to serve them with sincerity and competence is even more impossible no different from trying to get up a tree by climbing a broken rope. When any improvement is attempted, as reforming the worthless laws so that there is order and to change the rituals so that they are instructive and useful, such has only fear of the

¹⁷⁰ “The object and end of the science which is distinguished by the name of Jurisprudence, is the protection of rights.

...

What we desire to accomplish is, The protection of rights; What we have to inquire is, The means by which protection may be afforded.”

– Jurisprudence I, where so stupidly claims James Mill out of nowhere, beyond all justification and logic merely vomiting on his normatism of how others should behave; wholly blind to all of reality so that he works towards entirely imaginary aims in no way related to any tangible result or actual improvement of life.

¹⁷¹ “δύο γάρ ἐστιν οἷς ἡ δημοκρατία δοκεῖ ὀρίσθαι, τῷ τὸ πλεῖον εἶναι κύριον καὶ τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ· τὸ μὲν γὰρ δίκαιον ἴσον δοκεῖ εἶναι, ἴσον δ’ ὃ τι ἂν δόξῃ τῷ πλῆθει, τοῦτ’ εἶναι κύριον, ἐλεύθερον δὲ [καὶ ἴσον] τὸ ὃ τι ἂν βούληται τις ποιεῖν· ὥστε ζῆ ἐν ταῖς τοιαύταις δημοκρατίαις ἕκαστος ὡς βούλεται, καὶ εἰς ὃ χρηζών, ὡς φησὶν Εὐρυπίδης· τοῦτο δ’ ἐστὶ φαῦλον· οὐ γὰρ δεῖ οἴεσθαι δουλείαν εἶναι τὸ ζῆν πρὸς τὴν πολιτείαν, ἀλλὰ σωτηρίαν.”

– Πολιτικά, Politics, V, where so beautifully Aristotle criticizes that erroneous concept of freedom where everyone lives as it pleases him according to his fancy; that such is wrong and that men should not think it slavery to live according to the rule of constitution since it is actually their salvation.

critic from the people, but as Guo Yan says ‘he who seeks the highest virtue has no harmony with the popular opinion and he who does great deeds does not take council with the multitudes’.¹⁷²

That is what Democracy selects for; the optimal strategy on that environment is Corruption and Deceit – worse than being worthless, it actively selects for the detriment of society.

How terrible indeed to be wise or to try to be good when such is not advantageous¹⁷³, for which among such is elect as the leader of the gang if not the most errant scoundrel; incarnation of calumny who like a dog fawns and cajoles the ill-humoured deaf glutton that is the demonic autocrat Demos? And are not self-evident the words of the oracle who says that the marginal and his party shall reign until an even more abominable rascal arise? With the most absurd baseless promises and shameless bribery, but which the people are only too exalted with happiness in accepting the crumbs and short dreams!¹⁷⁴

¹⁷² “然則下官之冀遷者，皆曰：「多貨則上官可得而欲也。」曰：「我不以貨事上而求遷者，則如以狸餌鼠爾，必不冀矣。若以情事上而求遷者，則如引諸絕繩而求乘枉木也，愈不冀矣。之二者不可以得遷，則我焉得無下動取貨以事上，而以求遷乎！」”

– 商君書：農戰, Shang Jun Shu: Nong Zhan, III, where is described how worthless is a court that exchanges favours and uses of sophistical discourses to attain rank and power.

“君曰：「代立不忘社稷，君之道也；錯法務明主長，臣之行也。今吾欲變法以治，更禮以教百姓，恐天下之議我也。」

公孫鞅曰：「臣聞之，『疑行無成，疑事無功，』君亟定變法之慮，殆無顧天下之議之也。且夫有高人之行，固見負於世；有獨知之慮者，必見訾於民。語曰：『愚者闕於成事，知者見於未萌。民不可與慮始，而可與樂成。』郭偃之法曰：『論至德者，不和於俗；成大功者，不謀於眾。』法者，所以愛民也；禮者，所以便事也。是以聖人苟可以強國，不法其故；苟可以利民，不循其禮。」”

– 商君書：更法, Shang Jun Shu: Geng Fa, II-III, where Guo Yan says that those seeking virtue do not consult the masses; which ignorant masses cannot understand even the present or when some affair has been brought to completion, but the wise see the results even before it has sprouted.

¹⁷³ “ΤΕΙΡΕΣΙΑΣ

φεῦ φεῦ, φρονεῖν ὡς δεινὸν ἔνθα μὴ τέλῃ
λύῃ φρονοῦντι· ταῦτα γὰρ καλῶς ἐγὼ
εἰδὼς διώλεσ’· οὐ γὰρ ἂν δεῦρ’ ἰκόμην.”
– Οιδίπους Τύραννος, Tyrant Oedipus, 316-318.

¹⁷⁴ “ΔΗΜΟΣΘΕΝΗΣ

ὅπως· ὁ χρησμός ἀντικρυς λέγει
ὡς πρῶτα μὲν στυππειοπώλης γίγνεται,
ὅς πρῶτος ἐξεῖ τῆς πόλεως τὰ πράγματα.

They are delighted if some braggart come and being right or wrong throws upon them and their beliefs a flood of praises and flattery; they see not that such pigs are traitors who only sell them for gain and that money dictates all they profess – but they care not even if they know it to be endless slander, a tempest of abuse and a deluge of lies for much to the contrary as long as they are glorified and their opponents drowned in accusation they pallid with hunger gladly snap biting all calumny offered for them to devour.

What chance has he who is such an imprudent fellow with a brazen heart who dares to uphold an opinion contrary to that of them all; who promises happiness not by adulation, bribery, deceit or being a prostitute to the highest bidder, but instead of vain lauds points them to the better way – what is his chance to be laureated instead of receiving a chiton of stones¹⁷⁵, he who aims not at pleasing, but at saying what is true?¹⁷⁶

ΝΙΚΙΑΣ

εἷς οὐτοσὶ πώλης. τί τ' ούντεῦθεν; λέγε.

ΔΗΜΟΣΘΕΝΗΣ

μετὰ τοῦτον αὐθις προβατοπώλης δεύτερος.

ΝΙΚΙΑΣ

δύο τώδε πώλα. καὶ τί τόνδε χρή παθεῖν;

ΔΗΜΟΣΘΕΝΗΣ

κρατεῖν, ἕως ἕτερος ἀνὴρ βδελυρότερος
αὐτοῦ γένοιτο· μετὰ δὲ ταῦτ' ἀπόλλυται.
ἐπιγίγνεται γάρ βυρσοπώλης ὁ Παφλαγών,
ἄρπαξ κεκράκτης Κυκλοβόρου φωνὴν ἔχων.”

– *Ἰπτεῖς*, Knights, which geniality of criticism saddens us that he could only criticize Cleon; rather than eliciting the greater truths by generalizing his critics.

¹⁷⁵ “ἀλλὰ μάλα Τρῶες δευδήμονες· ἦ τέ κεν ἦδη
λαΐνον ἔσσο χιτῶνα κακῶν ἐνεχ’ ὅσσα ἔοργας”

– *Ἰλιάς*, *Iliad*, III: 56-57, where thus ‘receiving a chiton of stone’; to be stoned to death.

¹⁷⁶ Both this and the preceding paragraph are an amalgamation of the many beautiful expressions of Aristophanes against the demagogues, and the stupid people, of his time; mainly from the *Acharnians*.

“Graue erat in Aequos et Volsco proficisci: ante portas est bellum. Si inde non pellitur, iam intra moenia erit et arcem et Capitolium scandet et in domos uestras uos persequetur. Biennio ante senatus dilectum haberi et educi exercitum in Algidum iussit: sedemus desides domi mulierum ritu inter nos altercantes, praesenti pace laeti nec cernentes ex otio illo breui multiplex bellum rediturum. His ego gratiora dictu alia esse scio; sed me uera pro gratis loqui, etsi meum ingenium non moneret, necessitas cogit.”

– *Ab Urbe Condita*, From the Founding of the City, III: 68, to which we can add this outburst against the

For more than any rock on the way what makes a man stumble throwing him into danger is his mouth; and with a slip of my tongue I can behead my neck.¹⁷⁷

The Lakedaimonians had the insane law of training children in the art of stealing and ambushing, and they would be punished for being caught in the act and not for the act of stealing itself; yet as so Ksenophon might have said to a Lakedaimonian that he was the most fit for the endeavour of stealing the answer was the true nature of the democratic environment – as Cheirisophos said, the Athenians were the true masters at stealing as they dare to take from the public treasured even at great risk and trick them all as the very system thus perfectly selected for that master thief since those best at tricking the people were elected as magistrates.¹⁷⁸

Nicias, their most successful commander throughout the decades of the grand war, chose to waste the Athenian army and die in battle, since he knew that the correct choice of retreat would stain his name with disgrace of unjust condenations and an inglorious death by criminal execution¹⁷⁹; that is all the ignorant people would see, promptly forgetting any responsibility for

party struggles destroyin the City from the inside while war approaches from the outside; so that he 'knows there are more pleasant things to talk about, but necessity compels him to say what is true instead of what is agreeable'.

؟ألم تعلم أن ابن آدم رهين لسانه وأن لسان الأدمي هو الذي يوقعه في المهالك¹⁷⁷

وليس يموت المرء من عثرة الرجل
يموت القتي من عثرة في لسانه
وعثرته بالرجل تبرا على مهل
”فعرثته من فيه تقضي بحتفه

– A Thousand Nights And Night: The Tale Of King Qamar alZaman from Shahraman, where such danger of the tongue is told.

¹⁷⁸ “ἀτὰρ τί ἐγὼ περὶ κλοπῆς συμβάλλομαι; ὑμᾶς γὰρ ἔγωγε, ὦ Χειρίσοφε, ἀκούω τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίους ὅσοι ἐστὲ τῶν ὁμοίων εὐθὺς ἐκ παίδων κλέπτειν μελετᾶν, καὶ οὐκ αἰσχρὸν εἶναι ἀλλὰ καλὸν κλέπτειν ὅσα μὴ κωλύει νόμος, ὅπως δὲ ὡς κράτιστα κλέπτητε καὶ πειρᾷσθε λανθάνειν, νόμιμον ἄρα ὑμῖν ἐστίν, ἐὰν ληφθῇτε κλέπτοντες, μαστιγοῦσθαι. νῦν οὖν μάλα σοι καιρὸς ἐστὶν ἐπιδεῖξασθαι τὴν παιδείαν, καὶ φυλάξασθαι μὴ ληφθῶμεν κλέπτοντες τοῦ ὅρους, ὥς μὴ πληγὰς λάβωμεν. Ἀλλὰ μέντοι, ἔφη ὁ Χειρίσοφος, καὶ γὰρ ὑμᾶς τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἀκούω δεινοὺς εἶναι κλέπτειν τὰ δημόσια, καὶ μάλα ὄντος δεινοῦ κινδύνου τῷ κλέπτοντι, καὶ τοὺς κρατίστους μέντοι μάλιστα, εἴπερ ὑμῖν οἱ κράτιστοι ἄρχειν ἀξιούνται· ὥστε ὥρα καὶ σοὶ ἐπιδείκνυσθαι τὴν παιδείαν.”

– Κύρου Ανάβασις, Anabasis, IV: 6, with such a beautiful insight into what that environment truly selects for; the best thieves and the most corrupts since only an even greater hoodlum can so flatter the masses and buy out his adversaries to the point of stealing the throne to himself.

¹⁷⁹ “ἂ ἐπιστάμενος τῷ μὲν ἔργῳ ἔτι ἐπ’ ἀμφοτέρα ἔχων καὶ διασκοπῶν ἀνείχε, τῷ δ’ ἐμφανεῖ τότε λόγῳ οὐκ ἔφη ἀπάξειν τὴν στρατιάν. εὐ γὰρ εἰδέναι ὅτι Ἀθηναῖοι σφῶν ταῦτα οὐκ ἀποδέχονται, ὥστε μὴ αὐτῶν ψηφισαμένων ἀπελθεῖν. καὶ γὰρ οὐ τοὺς αὐτοὺς ψηφιεῖσθαι τε περὶ σφῶν [αὐτῶν] καὶ τὰ πράγματα ὥσπερ καὶ αὐτοὶ ὁρῶντας καὶ οὐκ ἄλλον ἐπιτιμῆσαι ἀκούσαντας γνώσεσθαι, ἀλλ’ ἐξ ὧν ἂν τίς εὖ λέγων διαβάλλοι,

their vote and simply seeking a scapegoat to take on the blame for any misfortune that may happen¹⁸⁰, rather than any qualification to judge if good measures were instead thwarted by evil fortunes¹⁸¹.

That is what the democratic environment selects for; far distant to any benefit the blind whim of the masses selects for the very opposite of being honest and saying an unpleasant truth – be it told to the people or to his party members.

Like on the farmer, those best able to produce the greater good for the State is to have the power over those farms, just as a skilled manager would be wasting his skills as a farmer and the State would suffer from that sad organization of its resources; as was a loss to society to have Deioces to remain in his private business so that they built golden Ecbatana for him to lord over¹⁸² – to end

ἐκ τούτων αὐτοὺς πείσεσθαι. τῶν τε παρόντων στρατιωτῶν πολλοὺς καὶ τοὺς πλείους ἔφη, οἱ νῦν βοῶσιν ὡς ἐν δεινοῖς ὄντες, ἐκείσε ἀφικομένους τάναντία βοήσεσθαι ὡς ὑπὸ χρημάτων καταπροδόντες οἱ στρατηγοὶ ἀπῆλθον. οὐκοῦν βούλεσθαι αὐτοὺς γε ἐπιστάμενος τὰς Ἀθηναίων φύσεις ἐπ’ αἰσχυρὰ τε αἰτία καὶ ἀδίκως ὑπ’ Ἀθηναίων ἀπολέσθαι μᾶλλον ἢ ὑπὸ τῶν πολεμίων, εἰ δεῖ, κινδυνεύσας τοῦτο παθεῖν ἰδίᾳ.”

– Ιστορία του Πελοποννησιακού Πολέμου, History of the Peloponnesian War, VII: 48.

¹⁸⁰ “ἐς δὲ τὰς Ἀθήνας ἐπειδὴ ἡγγέλθη, ἐπὶ πολὺ μὲν ἡπίστουν καὶ τοῖς πάντων στρατιωτῶν ἐξ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἔργου διαπεφευγόσι καὶ σαφῶς ἀγγέλλουσι, μὴ οὕτω γε ἄγαν πανσυδὶ διεφθάρθαι· ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἔγνωσαν, χαλεποὶ μὲν ἦσαν τοῖς ξυμπροθυμηθεῖσι τῶν ῥητόρων τὸν ἐκπλουν, ὥσπερ οὐκ αὐτοὶ ψηφισάμενοι, ὠργίζοντο δὲ καὶ τοῖς χρησιμολόγοις τε καὶ μάντεσι καὶ ὁπόσοι τι τότε αὐτοὺς θειάσαντες ἐπήλπισαν ὡς λήψονται Σικελίαν.”

– Ιστορία του Πελοποννησιακού Πολέμου, History of the Peloponnesian War, VIII: 1, ‘angry with the orators and soothsayers, forgetting they were the ones that voted for him’, as disaster strikes after they reward pleasing words and baseless promises rather than truth and certain science.

¹⁸¹ “In quo confiderem equidem causae meae, etiam si non apud Romanum sed apud Carthaginiensem senatum agerem, ubi in crucem tolli imperatores dicuntur, si prospero euentu, prauo consilio rem gesserunt.” – Ab Urbe Condita, From the Founding of the City, XXXVIII: 48, where the Carthaginian senate will crucify their commanders regardless of a successful outcome in battle; simply by the soundness of the method and strategy employed in not being reckless suffering unnecessary dangers which render a victory less profitable and a defeat more costly.

¹⁸² “ὁ δὲ δῆ, οἷα μνόμενος ἀρχήν, ἰθύς τε καὶ δίκαιος ἦν, ποιῶν τε ταῦτα ἔπαινον εἶχε οὐκ ὀλίγον πρὸς τῶν πολιητέων, οὕτω ὥστε πυνθανόμενοι οἱ ἐν τῇσι ἄλλῃσι κώμῃσι ὡς Δηϊόκης εἴη ἀνὴρ μόνος κατὰ τὸ ὀρθὸν δικάζων, πρότερον περιπίπτοντες ἀδίκοις γνώμῃσι, τότε ἐπεῖτε ἤκουσαν ἄσμενοι, ἐφοίτων παρὰ τὸν Δηϊόκεα καὶ αὐτοὶ δικασόμενοι, τέλος δὲ οὐδενὶ ἄλλῳ ἐπετράποντο.

πλεῖνός δὲ αἰεὶ γινόμενου τοῦ ἐπιποιετόντος, οἷα πυνθανομένων τὰς δίκας ἀποβαίνειν κατὰ τὸ ἐόν, γνοὺς ὁ Δηϊόκης ἐς ἐαυτὸν πᾶν ἀνακείμενον οὕτε κατίζειν ἐτι ἤθελε ἐνθα περ πρότερον προκατίζων ἐδίκασε, οὐτ’ ἔφη δίκαν ἐτι· οὐ γὰρ οἱ λυσiteléειν τῶν ἐαυτοῦ ἐξημεληκότα τοῖσι πέλας δι’ ἡμέρης δικάζειν. εὐούσης ὦν ἀρπαγῆς καὶ ἀνομίας ἐτι πολλῶ μᾶλλον ἀνὰ τὰς κώμας ἢ πρότερον ἦν, συνελέχθησαν οἱ Μῆδοι ἐς τὸ αὐτὸ καὶ ἐδίδωσαν σφίσι λόγον, λέγοντες περὶ τῶν κατηκόντων. ὡς δ’ ἐγὼ δοκέω, μάλιστα ἔλεγον οἱ τοῦ Δηϊόκεα φίλοι· “οὐ γὰρ δὴ τρόπῳ τῷ παρεόντι χρεώμενοι δυνατοὶ εἰμὲν οἰκέειν τὴν χώραν, φέρε στήσωμεν ἡμέων αὐτῶν βασιλεία· καὶ οὕτω ἢ τε χωρὶ ἑὺνομήσεται καὶ αὐτοὶ πρὸς ἔργα τρεφόμεθα, οὐδὲ ὑπ’ ἀνομίας

the evils of anarchy, which once subdued brought the legendary prosperity of Media with a quality of life multiplied manifold from their previous 'free' state.

Further on the international relations those democratic debauches share the blame and all abuse from the resources destroying the future together; a thing which no proper government or monarch would allow its country to sell their future for momentary gratification, but build a lasting legacy of a better future – nor allow other countries to so go on their licentiousness, for the detriment of the globe, while he is depriving his citizens of that luxury.

But rather, on our democratic hellhole, the united nations are more powerless together than even if they were apart.

War causes terrible misery and it is very foolish to engage on it when one is free to chose, but if the choice is between submission and independence then foolish is the one who refuses to take arms rather than he who does so¹⁸³; those who reject war in order to keep their peaceful tranquility and ease of confort will very quickly lose all such delights of peace that caused him to reject waring in the first place¹⁸⁴ – and how infinitely better and less harmful to humankind it would have been if some third world war enforced law over the globe rather than this hell of passively watching the lawless countries creating this awful future for the future generations.

Ignorance, and the biases that stem from it, is the mighty centrifugal force that has kept the States of humankind apart; and today we have many 'together' by pure negligence and mutual inaction rather than a sound foreign policy that imposing order selects for what is best for humankind collectively.

This, too, is a mark of our democratic government following the path of idle easeness rather than that which is best; and there has never been a more harmful war to humankind than this lawless peace we now live in.

ἀνάστατοι ἐσόμεθα." ταῦτα κη λέγοντες πείθουσι ἑαυτοὺς βασιλεύεσθαι."

– Ιστορία, Histories, I: 96-97.

¹⁸³ "Καὶ γὰρ οἷς μὲν αἵρεσις γεγένηται τᾶλλα εὐτυχούσι, πολλὰ ἄνοια πολεμήσαι· εἰ δ' ἀναγκαῖον ἦν ἢ εἴξαντας εὐθὺς τοῖς πέλας ὑπακούσαι ἢ κινδυνεύσαντας περιγενέσθαι, ὁ φυγὼν τὸν κίνδυνον τοῦ ὑποστάντος μεμπτότερος."

– Ιστορία του Πελοποννησιακού Πολέμου, History of the Peloponnesian War, II: 61.

¹⁸⁴ "ὅτι ὅπερ καὶ μὴ ὀκνεῖν δεῖ αὐτοὺς τὸν πόλεμον ἀντ' εἰρήνης μεταλαμβάνειν. ἀνδρῶν γὰρ σωφρόνων μὲν ἐστίν, εἰ μὴ ἀδικοῖντο, ἡσυχάζειν, ἀγαθῶν δὲ ἀδικουμένους ἐκ μὲν εἰρήνης πολεμεῖν, εὐ δὲ παρασχὼν ἐκ πολέμου πάλιν ξυμβῆναι, καὶ μήτε τῇ κατὰ πόλεμον εὐτυχίᾳ ἐπαίρεσθαι μήτε τῷ ἡσυχῶ τῆς εἰρήνης ἡδόμενον ἀδικεῖσθαι."

– Ιστορία του Πελοποννησιακού Πολέμου, History of the Peloponnesian War, I: 120.

III – Law And Freedom

All mentioned regulations and measures naturally have to be put into place by law so that the entire time we have been dealing with Legislation, but this part I focus on criminal legislation; more closely we have gone into the ‘rewards’ of Wealth and Authority that have to be thus properly conferred as here we consider the distribution of ‘punishments’ – mainly against the doctrines of ‘human rights’, which strongly rooted foolishness of our modern age I will with the mighty hand of Reason endeavour to utterly rip out from any decent thinker and crush into inexistence as the mindless detrimental normatism it is.

For the usual conceptual introduction on the moralist style let us first discuss ‘freedom’.

‘Freedom’ is not simply about ‘acting’, but truly about such actions not be unconsequential; it is about reaping the full unbarred consequences from what is done.

What freedom is there in jumping on the cage of a lion if there is still a fence there procting us?

What sense is there in being free to drink at will and whim, but still ask to be protected against inebriation?

So much opposed to the self-entitle modern culture, who think that freedom is doing think while behind the fence of protection to not have consequences, freedom is nothing more than properly receiving every fruit and consequence of his actions; the freedom of jumping into the cage as one well pleases and how he judges to be best for him – it is the responsibility and danger of rejected the control and restriction of others, so that who dares to open his mouth to say anything has the inevitable result of hearing the replies and be dismembered by the critics since ‘nothing is more invidious than opining’¹⁸³.

Thus the famous Renaissance line that ‘all are born free’ is a degrading lie; since if all were free no one would be ‘entitle’ to or would ‘deserve’ anything from the world in order to be free to make their own lives – loose like wild animals.

But to the contrary they use of the most unreal fallacy that ‘freedom’ is not to be free but ‘to have rights’ imposing on all persons in the world to be inherently forced to give to such what he wants; a disease which can only exist with the might of modern society which is ever more comfortable and less demanding – and which ever more fails to teach how all such comfort and rights come from the work of someone who thus gives it to them.

¹⁸³ “لا تتكلم فيما لا يعينك تسمع ما لا يرضيك”

- ألف ليلة وليلة: حكاية الحمال مع البنات - A Thousand Nights And Night: The Tale of the Peddler With The Girls.

And one who will only so give as long as he himself fulfil his commitments and honour his duties; so that every right is only acquired by being earned by his personal actions – without those ‘duties’ being performed there would neither be ‘rights’ to be given.

When any respects my ‘freedom’ by not doing something or by doing something for me that person is rendering me a service; and for that person to render me a service I have to render it back, or convince that person in some other way to do it, which is the duty.

Thus that freedom means that I am slave to no one and so I have no obligation to render any services as duties; and it also means that no one is my slave for them to have any obligation to render me any service that as their duties that give me ‘rights’ – and only upon arrange the exchange of favour between each other with mutual agreement there is all the benefit of not being alone, however such gain of rights is equally the loss of freedom since together with the ‘rights’ come the duties.

On this ‘social contract’ we also have described the situation of aborting or even throwing their babies away; as no one is born doing any service or duty so neither has he any inherent rights – rather a baby is a great impediment and risk to the body of the mother so that stopping those biological processes is a great gain to her, and then after birth to the parents who raise it a great physical and emotional cost. As just seen none is forced to incur all such duties; rather it is their choice to do so, or to throw it away for it to fend for itself.

Any restriction we impose is as the example on the previous chapter where people are deprived from defecating in the streets; a small privation of their freedom for a great good – and so that they may not throw their unwanted children on the streets or trash merely because it would be unpleasant to have a rotting carcasses thus polluting our urban environment, but which solution is to provide the designed places of disposal. The only instance where there is any sense in enforcing punishment for the disposal of developing zygotes or young babies is when the country is underpopulated; and which criminal charge is no greater than that benefit used to encourage the production of baby – so that in our modern world where there is most often no such encouragement nor medal for having a baby so too there is no reason to discourage and punish those who get rid of theirs, while if a country is overpopulated so that having babies is discouraged then rather abortions and infanticide are to be rewarded just as the measure that their opposite is punished.

Applying these policies, rather than neutrality, is a cost and have to thus result in some good for the population; which the violation of the right of working members of society for the sake of the meaningless belief that people are forced to raise those who cannot fend for themselves is far from any sound policy, but an normative endeavour with only detriments to the State.

I have repeated that case of abort thus at length not because it is a hot topic currently nor because it is pretty at all, but rather because of the repugnancy of the horrid imagery we evoke with those

lines about throwing babies to die; differently from many of the artificial religious norms we considered these ideas about some sancticity of our collective children so that we have to protect them at all cost is a hard-coded instinct in our brain from our most primal ancestors – but my point is that government is not made by such ‘instincts’ or such ‘guessing’ or ‘feeling’ what ‘should’ be, but hard and exact science with nothing but numbers in what will lead to the correct path where humankind is at its best possible station in life.

It might seem fantastical and something out of a terror movie to us in this more developed Western world, although I am in the South, some practice such as the famous Japanese practice of ‘decreasing mouths’ where they would lead some elder of the household to the woods and leave them lost to die there or would burry one of their young children in their backyard in order to relief the burden of feeding their families through thought times; or how so commonly during sieges people would boil and eat their own clothes and furniture until they were cannibalizing each other, or how still in many countries today families sell their young daughters to human trafficking in order to pay the bills – all these are necessary evils and although so horrid they are wise acts that allowed those families to live on, just as our own ancestors made enormous sacrifices that allowed us to be here today, instead of the symbolic worthless act of all perishing together.

Those are not ‘special cases’; and as said there are no ‘exceptions’ to any rule – ‘exceptions’, instead, show that any such rule or dogma is flawed and that there is some broader concept that rules over both cases.

And as seem that is simply that scientific reality of rather than a wilfully blind mind for us to consider the true effects that our actions will produce; and take that which will lead to the best possible outcome we can achieve, which often can be the less awful one.

There were many mindless movements against the usage of condoms when they came out; and how awful would things be if that normatism had won! Our current eight billion people is a tiny fraction of what this planet can support, but that only with the proper management and organization; on our current state of things it is already greatly overpopulated and in a natural crisis – and how utterly stupid are those fantastical ideals that rather than the real problems we have at hand to protest against the usage of condoms killing spems, the killing of developing zygotes in uterus or the killing of some infant human still devoid of any capacity.

Thus my point is that the view of ‘human rights’ is pure worse-than-worthless moralism, as treated so many times already, rather than any analysis of reality and the effects of such policy; rather we have that some people contribute much greater things to society making both the present and the future of humankind better, while others contribute about the same as they consume and yet others are just a detriment making life worse rather than any contribution.

As we assigned wealth to those skilled so too any 'merit' of authority and priority is due to those who contribute; the 'equality of rights' being no less harmful, impossible and meaningless than that arithmetical equality of economy – an insane dream that leads only to the worsening of society, rather than cultivating what is truly beneficial to our future.

If a train is moving on tracks and there is one person in one track and five in the other, and we pull a lever to can change the rails to redirect the train from the five persons to the single one, should we pull it?

The answer is very simple and we answered it dozens of time already; that is, 'what of those will result in a better future?' – or more directly, 'who contributes more to society?'.

Will society be affected in the same way regardless of what we do in that situation?

We have different outcomes from our action; and rather than the incomprehensible stupidity of considering the action itself there is only any meaning in considering what that action will result in – if they are equivalent regardless of what we do, or if one of those futures will be more beneficial, or less worse, to society.

If they are all average workmen we clearly will diminish the harm of that sad event to society by killing a single one rather than five; if the single one is rather one of the best curgions in the world then we would do much more harm to society by killing him rather than five average workmen who barely contribute their share – if there is five criminals in one side a single one in the other then we can do the best for society by having the train run over the five of them rather than eliminating just one detriment to society.

How infinitely easier if it is then five criminals in one side and the doctor in the other!

Truly slaughtering the criminals would most often be a much better option than running over the usual empty tracks; rather than an unfortunate event it is a gain to society to remove such defect to the general felicity of the nation.

Or any any still be so blind in his partisanship that he says some doctor who is about to 'cure cancer' is 'worth less' than two criminal so that we should choose the path that only one human dies since 'human lives are priceless'? But truly the criminals if left alive will actually kill many more humans; while the choice to kill two now will not only save those would-be victims, but allow millions each year to be saved from some horrible fate that was before unavoidable!

Is that a 'special case' and 'exception'? When does it stop being so? When the doctor would only cure tuberculosis? Perhaps if he were to only develop some better stitches? Any division is arbitrary and meaningless; it is an endless gradation of how positive, or negative, that being effects society – truly human lives are 'priceless', but simply because they are worth nothing since like

minerals or money or 'effort' they have no magical metaphysical 'inherent intrinsic value' except their only tangible and real measure that is of their actions in how their use that 'human life'.

There is no place for moralism, as I feel like I have to keep repeating, in any of this analysis of the causes and effect of our actions; any mindless norm and idealized fantasy will not achieve the optimal result and do what will benefit humankind most – rather than be 'moral' it would be an thoughtfully immortal choice to so close his eyes to the truth of the results to instead follow some imaginary good of his fantasies.

That is what I mean with this chapter of Legislation; and the meaningless of the idea of inherent 'human rights' which are today held as our most sacred law – just as no object holds some 'inherent value', by the metempsychosis of labour or what so ever else, so too 'inherent rights' are a harmful doctrine of acephalous norms far from any true benefit and good to society.

At the dawn of our Scientific Revolution the bud of economy bloomed too; as we began to understand phenomena as a series of processes that could be described as many interactions within definite laws we saw too that our measures of government were no different – and could be classed and analysed just as surely predicting results of how that would affect some commodity and the population, as the grand principle of offer and demand which took us farther than all Greek economists could.

Nowadays we have gathered a large body of such facts, as the effects of unemployment and recessions or the many points of the economy to which stimulate or dampen to produce some shift in its general course, but we have not gone beyond that; and on the art of Legislation we are even worse.

That is due to, as so often is, the perpetuation of preconceived ideas and erroneous guesswork rather than the surer foundations of science; and the illuminated minds that should have dispelled the darkness were instead the great bastions both defending it with all their might and taking it as their duty to disseminate their irrational belief to be cultivated on the mind of men – which have so successfully taken root that it has long been the great pest that hinders the power of Reason from graduating our politics into the realm of true sciences.

The cacophonical pandemonium of the Roman Republic advanced politics into tools with designed practical results, moving us past the Greeks who could produce nothing more than incoherent religious babble of how their perfectly virtuous king or commonwealth had to behave in order to please the gods with proper piety; yet for all those tools gained we have not progressed a step from the laws of Hammurabi and Draco – still blindly guessing by the worthless guide of morality and fantastical ideas of how others 'should' behave rather than the actual reality of the consequences and real effects of our actions.

Judges think themselves forensics and deliberating about the past, but that only exists to ascertain the truth of the matter; all we do will only affect the future – and how vain of a waste it is then to have laws that merely execute raw vengeance, and to call it ‘justice’ when they create a worse future.

If the punishment for homicide is death or perpetual imprisonment then we might save a few lives by separating the would-be victims from the criminal, howbeit that simple math only works for the lowest and basest rabble; one whose loss to society is an inferior detriment than the loss of those other persons saved, but then when we consider again that doctor above or any other such scientific who will have a much greater impact than a few thousands or millions of people we then see that killing him or imprisoning him as a punishment would be greatly more harmful to our future, and many more lives lost – any such acts that will hinder him from exerting his mastery is unthinkable if we want to do what is best for society, and how worthlessly mindless is ‘a tooth for a tooth and an eye for an eye’¹⁸⁶!

That is, any law even worth any consideration takes into account all factors it can in order to produce what is best for the future; the crime itself in the past is rather insignificant and beyond our power to change so that we take decisions only about the future we want to build – of which, then, one of the most important questions is ‘who did the crime?’, not treating all persons as if they were all homogeneous trash with none being more important than any other nor thinking about pleasing the animality and twisted moral sense of ‘justice’ from the immoral masses.

If a certain individual committed homicide and the law commands us to kill him, should we do it if we find him mid-air while he is the only pilot of the airplane with other hundreds of people in? Or does the law, not specifying any time limit, allows us to properly wait until it lands in order to not, because of some past killing that cannot be changed, kill those hundreds of people and ourselves?

Then, too, when we get to a doctor who commit homicide we would have to wait his entire life until he dies naturally since killing him would also result in the death of many others; we would not see the airplane immediately plunging to their deaths, but there cannot be any doubt in the mind of anyone that the lack of that professional will thus lead to the death of some who could and would have been saved by his skills.

¹⁸⁶ There have been found laws older than the famous code of Hammurabi, but not more well-known; and just as the sheer stupidity of his laws bear witness for the inexistence of Shamash, since he is a legislator as incompetent as any irrational wild animal and the divine character is limited by the capacity of his writer, so too the poor Hebrew copy of the Babylonian laws reveals the absolute idiocy of their deity since the unintelligent writer is incapable of writing an intelligent and wise character – as much as those endless flaws of ‘design’ and defects of the human body show beyond any doubt the inexistence of any creator, so too the worthlessness of all moralist laws of religions do the same evidencing their origin.

Just as all the world wanted to crush Nabis, and yet he could not be crushed without destroying all Lakedaimon so that wise Titus sagaciously choose to weaken him depriving him of any power to injure others rather than force unto the city a remedy too strong for it that would rather make it perish in the very process of recovering its liberty¹⁸⁷; just as with cancer we do not focus on an absolute cure from the disease, but are forced to aim at remission and control of it as the treatment for the total extermination of the disease would most often be more harmful and impairing to the body than the disease itself.

Criminal law, too, has no purpose but to find the optimal solution to an awful situation.

And the only way to do that is by analysing every case; the effects of each decision not on the individual, but on society being sadly deprived of his skills or happily freed from his threats – and some mindless law that merely analysis the act itself with a fixed penalty regardless of all other even more relevant factors is no different from trying to end diseases by applying the same medicine or treatment to all.

Laws are not made for their own good just so that they can be followed; nor for that meaningless revenge to satisfy some sense of justice – they are not some end goal, but means. They are instituted for the sake of the State; for the sole purpose that they will bring benefits to its inhabitants.

And if they fail to fulfil that purpose, and rather become harmful to the State, they have to be promptly destroyed; as truly is the case of our barbarous modern constitutions based solely on moralist guesswork.

That should be obvious and for a good part of the world we no longer follow that insanity of believing some ancient hard-coded law as absolute and unquestionable, although many nations still do, but something quite akin to it still happens as the study of ‘laws’ today deals not on any such science of how to enact good laws or improve the existing ones; but deal with discussing over fine-print, wordplays and all such disgusting buffoonery that the vile advocating lawyer class trains to do – abusing technicalities and being delighted more than in anything else to find some loop hole where they can pass wrongs as rights and cripple the authority of the State by blatantly and lawfully stealing both the public and private wealth.

Look back at the example of the house that hinders the construction of a road and feels entitled to ask for compensation thousands of times the value of that property; and how no State of any

¹⁸⁷ “Nec ignarus huius habitus animorum Quinctius, si sine excidio Lacedaemonis fieri potuisset, fatebatur pacis cum tyranno mentionem admittendam auribus non fuisse: nunc, cum aliter quam ruina grauissimae ciuitatis opprimi non posset, satius uisum esse tyrannum debilitatum ac totis prope uiribus ad nocendum cuiquam ademptis relinqui quam intermori uehementioribus quam quae pati possit remediis ciuitatem sinere, in ipsa uindicta libertatis perituram.”

– Ab Urbe Condita, From the Founding of the City, XXXIV: 49.

sound policy would give that worthless member of its society anything more than punishment for that harm he is causing to society – and yet the legislations of today would help him to sue the government and have his way.¹⁸⁸

If they abuse the wording of some injurious law or constitution written by some ignorant fool then it is just made clear we have to erase and get rid that stupidity that is the product of pure whimsical guesswork of his preconceived notions rather than binding ourselves to follow it as some sacrosanct divine commandment; and equally deal with that abuser and the vile lying scum that currently finds himself immune from all consequence at spewing the greatest blasphemies and lies for the sake of his criminal client.

This sorry states of affair truly reminds us of the most degenerate state the Rome Republic with its tribunes and the Athenian with its demagogues and dicasts¹⁸⁹; and on the little head of progress we might have made by pure experimental experience we are then inferior to the most uncouth lawless barbarian for they at least understand good sense and will not enforce some detrimental action against themselves because of some distortion or abuse of some wording of a law – it is hard to get any intellectually and morally worse than mindlessly following some paper for our own disadvantage and general infelicity while intentionally denying the profit of fair Reason.

Consider a four-panel comic famous in some groups; on which there is a deer posing for a photograph on the scope of a rifle so that when the hunter goes near the dying animal it says that the hunter can pose magestically too, but that there is something very wrong with his camera.

That is, obviously, some anti-hunting campaign made by some self-professed, and very ignorant, animal lovers.

But then we ask; if that animal Hou or Ou? Does it live apart from all the economy of nature?

Much the contrary they consume and destroy plants all the time; and differently from civilized humans they do not have preservatives – through their own lack of control and foolishness they have more offspring than what it is possible to sustain and on their competition for food they make others starve to death, but not before desolating the entire environment and causing a catastrophe not only upon the plants but upon themselves and every other animal there too.

¹⁸⁸ Or imagine those most ridiculous tales of such sue process being successful by the pure perfidy of lawyers and their clients; as the case of Redbull being sued for ‘promising they would grow wings’ forcing the company to pay compensation and even change its slogan – much more than just a ridiculous joke of a Nation, those legislation uphold the laws for their own sakes with not a thought about its true purpose of being an advantage, not a burden, to society.

¹⁸⁹ And how that sophistry of lawyers so infuriated Plato; just like today abusing the badly written laws for their own gain, and detriment of the State, since the judges, just like today, are bound to that worthless constitution above all Reason and good sense.

And so we took wolves by helicopter to Yellow Stone for the sole purpose of them killing such uncontrolled animals and save the environment; and so too we frequently kill millions of camels in Australia, or declare war at emus, for leaving them alive is a much greater catastrophe to every other living being than the slaughter of millions of those.

And so it is worth nothing to observe the environment if we also do not actively take action to shape it and keep its balance; a hunter who voluntarily goes out killing animals that are abounding is no less important than the environmentalist who saves animals who are on the edge of extinction – and the one who keeps the balance preventing extinction is even more important than that one who after the collapse comes to rebuild and replant when it is already impossible to restore it to its previous form.

On the same way that some well-intentioned and good-hearted person decides to release their pet on nature and plant some new plant species or that even for their own gain puts an end to every forest fire; but the result is the desolation caused by such invasive species which others now have to save nature by exterminating the invader and that they have to cause constant forest fires to maintain the cycle of trees and get rid of the accumulation of flammable material so that it may not come to happen the eventual catastrophic forest fire that they good intention above would cause.

Good intentions are not something wrong nor despicable, but neither are hunters and killers¹⁰⁰; just as the act of ‘acting’ is neutral so too no action partakes of any perfect Platonic form of the virtue of ‘good’ or ‘evil’ being intrinsically bad or good¹⁰¹ – it is the foolishness with which the

¹⁰⁰ “χωρίς τε τούτων τὰς πλείστας ἡμῖν ἐξηγεῖται τῶν περιπετειῶν, οὐχ ὑποτιθεῖς αἰτίαν καὶ τρόπον τοῖς γινομένοις, ὧν χωρὶς οὐτ’ ἐλεεῖν εὐλόγως οὐτ’ ὀργίζεσθαι καθηκόντως δυνατόν ἐπ’ οὐδενὶ τῶν συμβαινόντων. ἐπεὶ τίς ἀνθρώπων οὐ δεινὸν ἡγεῖται τύπτεσθαι τοὺς ἐλευθέρους; ἀλλ’ ὅμως, ἐὰν μὲν ἄρχων ἀδίκων χειρῶν πάθῃ τις τοῦτο, δικαίως κρίνεται πεπονθέναι· ἐὰν δ’ ἐπὶ διορθώσει καὶ μαθήσῃ ταῦτο τοῦτο γίνηται, προσέτι καὶ τιμῆς καὶ χάριτος οἱ τύπτοντες τοὺς ἐλευθέρους ἀξιοῦνται. καὶ μὴν τό γε τοὺς πολίτας ἀποκτείνουσα μέγιστον ἀσέβημα τίθεται καὶ μεγίστων ἄξιον προστίμων· καίτοι γε προφανῶς ὁ μὲν τὸν κλέπτῃν ἢ μοιχὸν ἀποκτείνας ἀθῶός ἐστιν, ὁ δὲ τὸν προδότῃν ἢ τύραννον τιμῶν καὶ προεδρείας τυγχάνει παρὰ πάνσιν. οὕτως ἐν παντὶ τὸ τέλος κεῖται τῆς διαλήψεως ὑπὲρ τούτων οὐκ ἐν τοῖς τελουμένοις, ἀλλ’ ἐν ταῖς αἰτίαις καὶ προαιρέσεσι τῶν πραττόντων καὶ ταῖς τούτων διαφοραῖς.”

– Ιστορία Πολυβίου, Histories from Polybius, II, where he thus criticizes mentioning a deed while omitting the cause since then one cannot feel the proper indignation or pity to any such described acts; as it vile to all that a person should be attacked, but then felt as only just when it was a response to violence and even praised when done for correction and discipline. Just as killing a citizen is a heinous crime with the highest penalties, yet killing a bandit leaves one guiltless of any punishment and one who kills a traitor, tyrant or the enemy receives gratitude and honour instead; so that he says that the final judgement does not depend on the thing done, but on the cause, on which of course he is wrong as the logical principle behind is rather that actions are not inherently good or bad, but only the results they produce are worth of any account.

¹⁰¹ “And the science of them is the true and only moral philosophy. For moral philosophy is nothing else but the science of what is good and evil in the conversation and society of mankind. Good and evil are names that signify our appetites and aversions, which in different tempers, customs, and doctrines of men are different:

action is performed, by the incapacity of judgment of what is fitting for the situation, that leads to undesirable disasters.

Such foolish comic, then, spreads the stigma against such action itself as intrinsically bad; it proliferates intolerance and ignorance instead of furnishing the knowledge which would allow one to judge between good and evil so that he knows the time to kill and the time to plant – it is an image which reveals the extreme stupidity of its author and instead of contributing to save the environment as it is supposed to be it is the opposite a hindering to the efforts that truly advance the Cause and to the education of the masses in comprehending how the world works and what must be made in each situation.

That is the flaw of such acephalous propaganda which is just incitation of hate and simplistic antagonism fuelled by ignorant prejudice; not only hurtful to the Cause of protecting the environment by making its followers dumber, but also gathering odium to itself and thus alienating others prospect collaborators from the Cause.

Thus, too, those who enforce hard-coded laws that link some past event to some fixed punishment are traitors to their own cause of directing humankind to a better future.

When it was a crime for women to not have their bodies fully covered on the beach, or how mindless Islam upholds today, was it because they were dumber then? What was their justification? What passed through their minds when they decided that it was criminal for women to show their knees at a beach? They, the governing body of worthless men by popular vote, merely ‘felt’ that such was ‘the right thing’; that was their sense of morality against such unthinkable ‘indecent’. And how does that change to our current law, where if you walk about naked it is again some unthinkable ‘indecent’ that will get you in jail? The severity and details have slightly changed in the west, but the law is exactly the same for the same worthless reasons

and diverse men differ not only in their judgement on the senses of what is pleasant and unpleasant to the taste, smell, hearing, touch, and sight; but also of what is conformable or disagreeable to reason in the actions of common life. Nay, the same man, in diverse times, differs from himself; and one time praiseth, that is, calleth good, what another time he dispraiseth, and calleth evil: from whence arise disputes, controversies, and at last war. And therefore so long as a man is in the condition of mere nature, which is a condition of war, private appetite is the measure of good and evil: and consequently all men agree on this, that peace is good, and therefore also the way or means of peace, which (as I have shown before) are justice, gratitude, modesty, equity, mercy, and the rest of the laws of nature, are good; that is to say, moral virtues; and their contrary vices, evil. Now the science of virtue and vice is moral philosophy; and therefore the true doctrine of the laws of nature is the true moral philosophy. But the writers of moral philosophy, though they acknowledge the same virtues and vices; yet, not seeing wherein consisted their goodness, nor that they come to be praised as the means of peaceable, sociable, and comfortable living, place them in a mediocrity of passions: as if not the cause, but the degree of daring, made fortitude; or not the cause, but the quantity of a gift, made liberality.”

– Leviathan I: XV.

which lead only to meaningless suffering and waste of resources rather than any improvement to our lives.

When we chemically castrated Turing; was that wrong ‘just because’ it was some absolutely stupid law for not purpose but increasing the suffering of the people, as an ‘outdated’ law against homosexuality?

It was, again, the stupidity of how they created that law; the worthless moralism of that such a person who did such an act ‘should’ then suffer as punishment just to please their hatred – what is no different from our irrational hard-coded law that some murder should meet some fixed punishment just because they feel that is ‘right’ and ‘what they deserve’ rather than any thought about the consequences that each choice will bring to the future of humankind.

Most people should be feeling some mindless hatred at those words and that some violent murder is nothing like that law against ‘harmless sexual choices’; yet that same hatred would be felt by society back then if you dared to question their irrational beliefs – those worthless feelings, begotten by your cultural indoctrination, are not, as I have endeavoured this entire treaty to demonstrate, any basis for judgement of what is to be done.

Any worthy judgement is made purely by Reason; and we have nothing more than Logic when arguing to demonstrate why some choice or another is the best we can make.

Monkeys also get enraged by their sense of justice; if one is given less food than some other it will complain and they will take action if they see some monkey stealing from some other – the injustice done to others tickles their empathy so greatly it is as if done to themselves. And thus they thirst to gratify their vengeance with no thought or reasoning behind it.

Let us take some extremely violent example; which merely appeal to sentimentalism, so great a fallacy, and in nothing changes the immutable reality of that all-encompassing logical principle devoid of exceptions.

While reading the Iliad in a certain café owned by a friend of mine, I suffered some casual question either from him or from his brother-in-law; they were triggered at some news shared on their chat group about rapists and that ‘even the guy that goes on about human rights’ already knows that the rapist will be raped in prison so that the rapist will likely kill himself – so that then they ask me what I think that should be done to rapists.

I answer ‘it depends’; as truly is the only correct answer to most things.

At that the brother-in-law laughs at a high pitch unable to control his sudden rage, but as he is about to say something at me my friend puts his hand telling him to be quiet before saying that he also agrees that it depends; so that he now reforms his question and asks me what should be done then to a guy who rapes his own infant daughter.

To which I repeat that ‘it depends’.

The brother-in-law goes hysterical on his uncontrolled laughter and my friend enraged asks ‘it depends ON WHAT!?’.

To which I answer ‘of whom it is’.

The laughing guy manages to go even higher as he falls upon a table and now I too join him laughing at them; meanwhile my friend just looks at me quietly before saying that his body even started shaking with rage after hearing a thing like that – at which point no more questions were asked.

That aversion to my answer is just what most would expect, but at this point you surely know what exact science I had on my mind when I answered; that reality is not so black and white to so stupidly some absolute law overrule all other factors that ought to be considered – that is, that it is not a question about what would gratify his taste for renege on some shallow morals, but what will bring the best final outcome.

That is something those monkeys cannot possibly understand; and thought all of human history I have not yet seen any code of law or ruler able to grasp even the most basic concept of legislation – we have not been any little better than the most savage quadrumana.

At that time I thought about a modern example; even more relevant to him personally since his wife would need a caesarian soon, and rather than reasoning the masses can only see their own situation and feelings. The example I left unsaid, since I was certain it would lead to altercations rather than any understanding, was about the fathers of computation so crucial to our modern world of technology; about what would happen if one such crucial piece were to thus rape his own infant daughter on her cradle.

Supposing we turned a blind eye, for the sake of simplicity leaving just impunity, we would have our modern world as it is.

Supposing we applied that absolute unwielding law we would have killed him or done some other greater atrocity that would render him useless to society; so that our technology today would be on the very least less advanced – to which, as said, just fifty years ago humankind was half its current size and such growth is only possible due to the new technologies which sustain the food, energy and health of the people. Without such things there might have been born even more people since rather than the modern condition of a high investment in one or two offsprings they would be the traditional families with fifteen children as many would die on birth or on their infancy be it by the impossibility of feeding them all with the inefficient hard work of producing food primitively or from any infection and disease one got; so that even if we wanted to grow and reach this current population, we would be kept down by our incapacity of so doing – the lack of such gigantic construction of a father of computation would delay every computer, of which every

plane and machine depends, delaying all such agricultural, logistic, exchange of ideas besides all the genetic that without the modern equipment would not even exist just as with it would disappear most of our modern medicine.

Such is the effect in just a few decades of such most foolish measure; more than just a more uncomfortable life, it would be a source of much suffering incomparably greater than he himself caused – a suffering in the past, which we cannot erase, and because of that we would inflict upon ourselves such infinitely more harmful punishment for some imaginary ‘deserved right’ to a girl who none would remember at all after those few decades between then and the present, but the lack of his contributions to the world would be monumental to humankind.

Is that diseased future of more difficulties ‘the right choice’? Is that what laws are for? Is that what most benefits the future of humankind?

Just as that ‘arithmetical equality’ in Economy is so utterly detrimental to society, since far from equal each individual contributes differently, so too is that dogma that ‘all are equal before the law’; when truly each is of different importance and forcing that arithmetical equality over them only leads to no improvement of life, but to further calamity.

Naturally there is the very powerful factor of the social impact of such norms; in the society of today having rapists walking free after some slight fine to their Authority in society or someone with a slave would rise the outcry of the entire world with our ‘cancel culture’, although as commonly known we lived with immense impunity both by politicians with their connections and the usual line that ‘if the law can be evaded with a fine then the law only exist for the poor’ – but far from insurmountable barriers those are just the modern dogmas, just as slavery was completely accepted throughout most of our history or how the death spectacles of gladiators that today would be so shocking where the fun that our Roman ancestors anxiously looked up to.

So easily is that ‘human nature’ of empathy and aversion to some thing conquered by culture; and which culture is then readily shaped by its surroundings – that is, the moody whims and tastes of the people are only a factor on this shortest timescale of the immediate present.

As society lets go of those worthless norms we today have we thus progress into a state where the people are less stupid so that they can actually understand the purpose of law and the consequence of their actions; that it is not to please anyone nor just to dish punishment for the sake of punishment, but that they aim to what is of benefit for most¹⁹².

¹⁹² "Nulla lex satis commoda omnibus est: id modo quaeritur, si maiori parti et in summam prodest."

– Ab Urbe Condita, From the Founding of the City, XXXIV: 4.

On the beginning it perhaps seemed like I was about to talk of some violent brutality of punishment, as when I mentioned of how beneficial and good for society for the train to run over five criminals rather than over empty tracks, but then I let out this plot twist where I actually defend the impunity, or rather much less harsh punishment, of some; now, however, let us go back to that ultimate punishment, as it is also an important factor in society – and this misuse in this area is so greatly that being implemented straight away the absolute benefits would still dwarf any meaningless consternation and protest of our acephalous modern culture.

Killing, as aforementioned, is already a benefit; in contrast with feeding criminals in some locked room, but is that the best use we can make of that scum of society – merely spending our resources to hunt down and eliminate them?

Freedom of knowledge is necessary for the development of mental faculties and thus the improvement of the State; that is a giant problem on those authoritarian States that try to control every aspect of life, as that fantastical one of Plato or the nightmare-come-true that is Communism as in modern China, since allowing those ‘undesirable truths’ out will also increase dissidence making the people harder to control, but that is seeing it as a cost and trouble – crime is solved by having a demand for it.

For example as Order would so greatly improve on ancient States when there was a shortage of slaves; since then citizens would be scrutinized in their lawful conduct – hunting down criminals was not just the costly elimination of neutralizing some detriment, but some actual benefit and gain to the State, and private individuals, in doing so.

And while for most of human history that was indeed the reality of the States, so well Selected as some wonderful idea that so greatly increased the fitness of that State, today we can do even better.

It is incredible human medicine attained this level without relying on human experiments, but such imaginary ‘moral’ stupidity is a plague to progress as much as the idea of dead bodies being impure so all of medicine was crushed by the church for two millenia and so much more than ten thousand times the suffering and harm is caused by maintaining that norm from their fantasies for purely imaginary aims; instead killing people for crimes entirely wasting it for petty useless feelings of vengeful ‘justice’ or consuming the public resources to maintain that harmful deficit to society as a useless caged animal are awful measures to any State – using them, then, both advances humankind preventing incalculable suffering for humanity as it saves the very resources of the State to be used in more fruitful endeavours while increasing security by getting rid and hunting that the criminal diseases.

Not only an endeavour that will so much strength this most greater good of medicine, but using of that niche which instead is costing much purely to go to waste.

The RNA vaccine for Covid is a monumental work too grand for the common mind to comprehend the magnitude of the feat; it came out in months because of the desperate global effort, but sadly drugs usually come out in decades – there is strictest regulation on every of the many phases of trial, as correctly so as we have seen many times last century the horrid effects of careless regulations upon drugs released on the market, but by the time we hear of a research it is most often some almost worthless correlation rather than solid science showing an exact mechanics through which the causes create the effects or that it shew effects in mice with the caveat that ‘mice are not humans’.

Tests directly on humans would instantly show the answer of what today takes meaninglessly roundabout decades of theory; and so much more it would show furthering our knowledge of the human body regardless of the drug working as intended or not – the refusal to use humans is even worse than if we were to comply to the braindead calls against using mice in science, a such destructive choice to the future and progress of humankind taken for the sake of some unreal moralistic fantasy.

And there is no difference between the squeak of a mouse and the cries of a human; we have now long discovered that we are not made to the image of some deity and that neither is nature at our feet being created for our sake at our disposal with we being the only holy thing – we are just animals and ‘suffering’ in both cases is a mere chemical reaction that can be turned off with the cutting of a wire, a nerve, but which purpose of doing so is meaningless.

And while we breed rats, and many other things, just for that purpose we ignore the most valuable subjects being either slaughtered to be thrown in the trash or left uselessly idle in a cell; prolonging this accursed diseased state of ours while using our resources to our own detriment in such worthless measures against crime – this apex of stupidity, and the empire that the mindless Renaissance fantasies still hold upon the mind of virtually all, appals me beyond what I can properly put down in words.

It is like seeing a world where the Dao won and forced its ideals upon all; seeing virtue and the arts being called ‘evil’ and ‘immoral’ when those exact arts are what saves us from this sad conditions, but also when their imaginary rightousness are catastrophic ever worsening our own situation.

If all persons were good it could rise the question about our purpose as a society when faced with the question of experiment with innocents; losing their little contribution for the greater good of all – but that is far from our situation and there is no question about getting rid of the criminal scum that being left free or kept jailed is a detriment to society, and how infinitely better if rather than all just waste it could make them the most productive endeavour we have.

Having dealt with that critic of the meaningless revenge, we arrive at this other idea that if we put some really awful punishment then people will not commit the crime; above I have mentioned

how infinitely better to society it is to get the greatest benefit from their usage, rather than that wasteful show of terror, and now I will deal with how that terror is as meaningless as that mindless revenge.

“Indeed some laws are frightening and it is a true conclusion that it will evoke dread on people. But what must we think of the one who throws away his weapons and flee from battle or all his duty he eases to fulfil? Should he suffer the terrible law too? Do we think that he has excess of bravery? Or the opposite, of cowardice? How then does giving him more dread is beneficial to him or hinder those who already fail due to fear from failing? And who attacks his brother or friend, does he not do so on the heat of the moment by not controlling his rage? And does not an adulterer commits his mistake due to uncontrolled sexual desire? The miser who does not contribute and who steals and the profligate who spends in excess with every vice; the slothful who does not work and the ambitious who for honours causes ruin and tries to do more than he is able to – does not the stupid wrongly guides by being ignorant and the con-man does so for his advantage by being smarter than those who follow him?”

Who then does ‘more dread’ will end crimes? Does not one needs more bravery and to the reckless more cowardice? More self-control and temperance and moderation? They commit crimes due to their lack of certain virtues; not by any lack of fear.”

That pretty demonstration of ‘virtues’ is the critic that Aristotle makes against such brutality and harshness of laws, although I cannot remember the exact location of it right now, correctly arguing that they should be a way to improve society, and not for the people to vent their petty revenge; although he does takes some crimes, as of heresy, to be deserving solely of punishment as in the end he falls to the meaninglessness of upholding those Platonic norms of ‘right’ and ‘wrong’¹⁹³ –

¹⁹³ “ἐγὼ δ’ Ἀριστόμαχον, εἰ καὶ μηδὲν εἰς τοὺς Ἀχαιοὺς ἕτερον ἡμαρτεν, κατὰ γε τὴν τοῦ βίου προαίρεσιν καὶ τὴν εἰς πατρίδα παρανομίαν τῆς μεγίστης ἄξιον κρίνω τιμωρίας. καίπερ ὁ συγγραφεὺς βουλόμενος αὖτις αὐτοῦ τὴν δόξαν καὶ παραστήσασθαι τοὺς ἀκούοντας εἰς τὸ μᾶλλον αὐτῷ συναγανακτεῖν ἐφ’ οἷς ἔπαθεν οὐ μόνον αὐτόν φησι γεγονέναι τύραννον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκ τυράννων πεφυκέναι. ταύτης δὲ μείζω κατηγορίαν ἢ πικροτέραν οὐδ’ ἂν εἰπεῖν ῥαδίως δύναται· οὐδεὶς. αὐτὸ γὰρ τοῦνομα περιέχει τὴν ἀσεβειστάτην ἔμφασιν καὶ πάσας περιεῖληφε τὰς ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἀδικίας καὶ παρανομίας. Ἀριστόμαχος δ’ εἰ τὰς δεινότητας ὑπέμεινε τιμωρίας, ὥς οὗτός φησιν, ὅμως οὐχ ἱκανὴν ἔδωκεν δίκην μιᾷς ἡμέρας.”

– Ιστορίαι Πολυβίου, *Histories from Polybius*, II, where thus rabbit Polybius declares that all punishment of torture or what else it is said that has befallen Aristomachos is not enough to expiate his crimes ‘of a single day’; ‘as the name of Tyrant carries with it all forms of the most evil things’.

“τὸ δ’ ἀκόλουθον καὶ τὸ τῆς ἱστορίας ἴδιον ἀφείλεν, τὸν ἔπαινον καὶ τὴν ἐπ’ ἀγαθῷ μνήμην τῶν ἀξιολόγων προαιρέσεων. καίτοι γ’ ἐμποδὼν ἦν.”

– Ιστορίαι Πολυβίου, *Histories from Polybius*, II, so greatly falling his duty as a historian and much otherwise declaring that such a duty is to comment his own moral views condensing with insults or honouring with praises the characters of History; showing only the shallowness of his intellect in opining in the ‘hobleness’ of things with his meaningless beliefs of imaginary aims just to waste our time rather than describing the due facts of History or commenting some proper learned tactical analysis of the situations at hand with the effects it had on the future instead of how ‘gallant’ was the death of some general foolishly charging athwart the enemy.

rather than going all the way that the purpose of laws is to, always¹⁹⁴, deliberate what will lead to the best future.

That is not to say that we are to become tender-hearted and ruled by mindless emotion as we see their present distress; nor are we to recall as nearly as possible how we suffer and how we would have given anything to crush them back then¹⁹⁵ – we rather have to not betray our own cause of making a better future than the one we are thus beset by these calamities.

“From the earliest time all kinds of States have used of death penalty for their most impious crimes, or even for puny ones; and from all kinds of tortures humankind as run out of new horrors to try to inflict as punishment, but it still failed to contain crime and revolt. Can we then discover some terror more dreadful than death, since death is clearly no prevention for crimes? Rather then no one commits a crime believing that he will be caught; the risks are diminished and the rewarded enlarged by his hopes of success – he is not thinking about failure, but prepared for success. Further men are lured into disregarding all danger as they are driven by poverty and misery, making them reckless and bold, as much as the insolence and pride, which makes them greedy and confident; so too to the other various passions so that led by Desire they contrive plans with Hope so that those ghosts prevail over the possible dangers at every opportunity – how impossible then, and a show of absolute foolishness, to think that when human nature decided to attempt something the rigours of law and terrors can divert them from attempting it.”¹⁹⁶

¹⁹⁴ “ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐ δικαζόμεθα πρὸς αὐτούς, ὥστε τῶν δικαίων δεῖν, ἀλλὰ βουλευόμεθα περὶ αὐτῶν, ὅπως χρησίμως ἔξουσιν.”

– Ιστορία του Πελοποννησιακού Πολέμου, History of the Peloponnesian War, III: XLIV, where thus he differentiate the law courts of judging ‘justice’ for citizens and the laws to deal with foreigners in considering rather ‘what is most useful to do’, but which of course I say that expediency is the only purpose of law and not those imaginary aims, and terrible results, of Platonic ‘justice’.

¹⁹⁵ “Μὴ οὖν προδοταὶ γέννησε ὑμῶν αὐτῶν, γενόμενοι δ’ ὅτι ἐγγύτατα τῇ γνώμῃ τοῦ πάσχειν καὶ ὡς πρὸ παντὸς ἂν ἐτίμησασθε αὐτοὺς χειρώσασθαι, νῦν ἀνταπόδοτε μὴ μαλακισθέντες πρὸς τὸ παρὸν αὐτίκα μηδὲ τοῦ ἐπικρεμασθέντος ποτὲ δεινοῦ ἀμνημονοῦντες. κολάσατε δὲ ἀξίως τούτους τε καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ξυμμάχοις παρὰδειγμα σαφὲς καταστήσατε, ὅς ἂν ἀφιστῇται, θανάτῳ ζημωσόμενον. τότε γὰρ ἦν γνώσιν, ἦσσαν τῶν πολεμίων ἀμελήσαντες τοῖς ὑμετέροις αὐτῶν μαχεῖσθε ξυμμάχοις.”

– Ιστορία του Πελοποννησιακού Πολέμου, History of the Peloponnesian War, III: XL, the advice of perfidious Cleon.

¹⁹⁶ “Ἐν οὖν ταῖς πόλεσι πολλῶν θανάτου ζημία πρόκειται, καὶ οὐκ ἴσων τῷδε, ἀλλ’ ἐλασσόνων ἁμαρτημάτων· ὁμως δὲ τῇ ἐλπίδι ἐπαιρόμενοι κινδυνεύουσιν, καὶ οὐδεὶς πῶ καταγνοὺς ἑαυτοῦ μὴ περιέσεσθαι τῷ ἐπιβουλεύματι ἦλθεν ἐς τὸ δεινόν. πόλις τε ἀφισταμένη τίς πῶ ἦσσω τῇ δοκῇσει ἔχουσα τὴν παρασκευὴν ἢ οἰκείαν ἢ ἄλλων ξυμμαχία τοῦτο ἐπεχείρησεν; πεφύκασί τε ἅπαντες καὶ ἰδία καὶ δημοσία ἁμαρτάνειν, καὶ οὐκ ἔστι νόμος ὅστις ἀπείρξει τούτου, ἐπεὶ διεξεληλύθασί γε διὰ πασῶν τῶν ζημιῶν οἱ ἄνθρωποι προστιθέντες, εἴ πως ἦσσαν ἀδικοῖντο ὑπὸ τῶν κακούργων. καὶ εἰκὸς τὸ πάλοι τῶν μεγίστων ἀδικημάτων μαλακωτέρας κείσθαι αὐτάς, παραβαινομένων δὲ τῷ χρόνῳ ἐς τὸν θάνατον αἱ πολλαὶ ἀνήκουσιν· καὶ τοῦτο ὁμως παραβαίνεται. ἢ τοίνυν δεινότερόν τι τοῦτο δέος εὐρετέον ἐστίν ἢ τότε γε

As I write this there is a faction war happening openly, on which a policeman was killed some two weeks ago so that now the police force entered the war, on the capital of my state of Bahia; we from the surrounding cities hear about the daily massacres and everyone knows, and mostly approve, that contrary to the official law the police is intentionally killing many just to get rid of them without reporting.

But of course the causes for turning to banditry are not affected in the least; rather misery and hatred are increased thus so that everyone knows that some other criminals will be happy to take the place of the old ones - that is exactly the case even if there was not the nation-wide crime organizations that compete for the supremacy of the trafficking in each state.

Simply put the causes, that environment that thus selects for the specialization into banditry, is not treated in the least by our acephalous measures; sitting by a certain cafeteria of my liking where I do much of my reading it has often become the topic of commentaries to mention the daily news of deaths on each side of the conflict, and then the approval for the lawless actions of the police killing them is followed by the hopeless complaints that it will just alleviate it for a moment as 'a solution is impossible' - and no functional mind disagrees that the lawless killings are indeed better than the official law in which they are sent to jail which are ruled over completely by factions so

οὐδὲν ἐπίσχει, ἀλλ' ἡ μὲν πενία ἀνάγκη τὴν τόλμαν παρέχουσα, ἡ δ' ἐξουσία ὕβρει τὴν πλεονεξίαν καὶ φρονήματι, αἱ δ' ἄλλαι ξυντυχίαι ὀργῇ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὥς ἐκάστη τις κατέχεται ὑπ' ἀνηκέστου τινὸς κρείσσονος ἐξάγουσιν ἐς τοὺς κινδύνους. ἡ τε ἐλπίς καὶ ὁ ἔρως ἐπὶ παντί, ὁ μὲν ἡγούμενος, ἡ δ' ἐφεπομένη, καὶ ὁ μὲν τὴν ἐπιβουλὴν ἐκφροντίζων, ἡ δὲ τὴν εὐπορίαν τῆς τύχης ὑποτιθεῖσα, πλείστα βλάπτουσι, καὶ ὄντα ἀφανὴ κρείσσω ἐστὶ τῶν ὁρωμένων δεινῶν. καὶ ἡ τύχη ἐπ' αὐτοῖς οὐδὲν ἔλασσον ξυμβάλλεται ἐς τὸ ἐπαίρειν· ἀδοκήτως γὰρ ἔστιν ὅτε παρισταμένη καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὑποδεεστέρων κινδυνεύειν τινὰ προάγει, καὶ οὐχ ἦσσαν τὰς πόλεις, ὅσῳ περὶ τῶν μεγίστων τε, ἐλευθερίας ἢ ἄλλων ἀρχῆς, καὶ μετὰ πάντων ἕκαστος ἀλογίστως ἐπὶ πλέον τὸν αὐτὸν ἐδόξασεν. ἀπλῶς τε ἀδύνατον καὶ πολλῆς εὐηθείας, ὅστις οἶεται τῆς ἀνθρωπείας φύσεως ὁρμωμένης προθύμως τι πρᾶξαι ἀποτροπὴν τινα ἔχειν ἢ νόμον ἰσχύϊ ἢ ἄλλῳ τῷ δεινῷ. Οὐκ οὐκ χρὴ οὐτε τοῦ θανάτου τῇ ζημίᾳ ὥς ἐχέγγυον πιστεῦσαντας χεῖρον βουλευέσασθαι οὐτε ἀνέλπιστον καταστήσαι τοῖς ἀποστάσιν ὥς οὐκ ἔσται μεταγνώναι καὶ ὅτι ἐν βραχυτάτῃ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν καταλῦσαι.”

- Ιστορία του Πελοποννησιακοῦ Πολέμου, History of the Peloponnesian War, III: XLV-XLVI.

“καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἄδεια ἐφαίνετο αὐτοῖς, ἐνγευσμένοι μὲν τῆς Ἀθηναίων δυνάμεως ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ὅση ὕστερον διεφάνη, τὸ δὲ πλέον βουλῇσιν κρίνοντες ἀσαφεῖ ἢ προνοία ἀσφαλεῖ, εἰσθότες οἱ ἄνθρωποι οὐ μὲν ἐπιθυμοῦσιν ἐλπίδι ὑπερὶσκεπτῶν διδόναι, ὃ δὲ μὴ προσίενται λογισμῷ αὐτοκράτορι διωθεῖσθαι.”

- Ιστορία του Πελοποννησιακοῦ Πολέμου, History of the Peloponnesian War, IV: CVIII, where a little later he beautifully says that the judgement of men are led by their wishes rather than caution; so that they trust in their Hope with no reflection of foresight, but rather they reject to even arbitrate about that which they do not want to think about.

Which I need only to conclude that the only solution is fighting both that misery that drives then as crushing all Hope of impunity, not by terrors; just as to make use of that as an opportunity and derive infinitely more value from that than just a worthless show of horrific savagery - a niche for the usage of those criminals and what our modern surveillance capacities have long made possible if the people were not too mindless to rather safety than their 'right of privacy' in not being seen on the street, simple measures which will leaves us wanting more criminals and not finding enough.

that even the pettiest criminal is forced to join one or die, often called a 'factory of organized crime' rather than a place where any improvement can be attained, and from which they will soon be released back to pester society.

It is so tragic that it is comical the height of stupidity of such government, and which is the standard around the world; their mismanagement spend hard-earned resource to raise millions of criminals - paying to increase misery and feeling holy about their magnanimous and merciful ways, seeing just their own sanctified norms of moral rather than the resultant effects they have in actual reality.

Any can say that the old savage laws, as the policemen are illegally doing, are better than our modern ways, but that is a rather superfluous line since our modern laws are so insane and detrimental that it would be impossible to thus feed the feasting disease of millions worse-than-worthless humans before our current might of mass production; rather than point the obvious, that it is worse, we have to ask 'why is it worse?', and then at the savage draconian laws we follow on asking 'is that then the best possible measure?' - which budding insights of science will lead us to find these same answer as in biology or in economy with all other human disciplines, of tangible results of improvement and good coming only from those exact measures that thus select for what is most beneficial.

As literal trash and faeces which caused horrible pestilences and damage to human health being then a painful cost to shove that pollution somewhere far from us, but which as means of recycling and of fertilization became known we now seek those to the point that some have to import from outside the trash of others; so too the pestilence of crime is only a harm to society because we thus spend greatly to simply try to crush it so that it stops hurting us, but only a proper advantageous niche of using that human scum for some purpose will make us have a shortage of criminals and that it would be better if we had some more.

Having dealt on these long themes of how law should be enacted for the good of society, rather than the gratification of savagery, about the due usage of those human beings we are forced to separate from society we arrive then at this final point; in actually preventing crime from happening in the first place, since we have seen the show of horror to be a worthless check to that.

What government will use its resources to uphold the right of criminal organizations of communicating and transacting their deeds in privacy and safety? Those of our modern world only. Once upon a time gatherings needed to communicate in mass were extremely hard things to do unnoticed and safely while trusting others to rely criminal information was so very dangerous to all parties involved and a time-consuming endeavour; today they are not only instantaneous, but also with the absolute safety of private anonymity - that is what messaging applications provide them and what the people, who control the government, defends.

Most crimes will not even be found, much less prevented, without surveillance and it is clear how imperative it is to scan every message in order to check organized crime, which has been allowed to become so great a force within modern countries; a task truly impossible just a few years back, although much could have been done by storing all such communication and searching key terms over that data, and which now can be cheaply done with the fine-tuning of backpropagation in multi-layered decision-making, ‘neural’, networks – the more the State knows the more it can protect its citizen, be it from crime or accident or disease on individual levels or from economic troubles or infrastructural deficiencies or misuse of the public funds on the statual level, and obviously conversely the less the State knows the less capable it is.

But I will cut this short and be straight with it; as you have now repeatedly seen my scientific reasoning and if by your preconceived biases you doubt my words you now have the tools to prove its Truth to yourself – that all things are naked to him whom we have to pay our dues¹⁹⁷, that is that it is utterly incomprehensible how people oppose having safe streets because they ‘do not want to be seen walking about in public’, oppose the surveillance of crime because they ‘do not want to have their messages read’ and oppose the most optimal hiring strategy and their own well-being because ‘it is discrimination for others to not hire me blind just having to trust my resume rather than concrete knowledge of my employment and behavioural records together with my health’¹⁹⁸.

That is, the State has to know everything it can in order to be able to do the best it can; its knowledge and Power truly converge into one¹⁹⁹.

¹⁹⁷ “καὶ οὐκ ἔστι κτίσις ἀφανὴς ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ· πάντα δὲ γυμνά καὶ τετραχλησμένα τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτοῦ, πρὸς ὃν ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος.”

– προς Εβραίους, To The Hebrews , IV: 13, for the familiar and beautiful wording, although that idea of the magical imaginary being watching and judging every deed as been dealt with a little before.

¹⁹⁸ Besides the old mindless aversion to cameras on the street, as so ignorantly fantasized by the feeble intellect of Orwell, there is now an aggressive trend of ‘privacy’ where virtual networks and the like are used to pass misleading data which is quite a national crime lying to the government, but the government itself, for its own detriment, protect those mindless rights of digital information collected for the individual, just as for medical information forcing companies to hire in blind ignorance and suffer the scam of now paying for the disease of others rather than use certain knowledge to hire the most fit for the job; even in sewage we can learn about antibiotic-resistant bacteria, the eating habits of a population and the spreading of disease in that area, but that same acephalous group above call upon their sacred dogma of ‘privacy’ and forced the government to become this useless dead-weight as the Power of knowledge, which would save us from those miseries, is offensive to them – a height of democratic licentiousness that dwarfs even that one Athenian lawless freedom criticized by Aristotle as quoted a few pages ago.

¹⁹⁹ “Scientia et potentia humana in idem coincidunt, quia ignoratio causae destituit effectum. Natura enim non nisi parendo vincitur: et quod in contemplatione instar causae est, id in operatione instar regulae est.”
– Novum Organum Unus III.

That certain knowledge is the most basic condition for the correct distribution of rewards and punishments; and as implied on ‘meritocracy’ the good being robbed of their pay is equally hateful with the bad being reward for no good work – the felicity of the good and infelicity of the bad are the same goal, and it all starts with that absolute knowledge or we will not even be able to tell the two of them apart.

And the unhappiness of foolish Philip was caused more by the success and survival of perfidious Perseus than the defeat and death of daft Demetrius.²⁰⁰

We certainly do not want that Power, or any at all, in the hands of a bad government, as those Platonic communists which do aim at that or on the hands of the corrupt democratic demagogues of today who would promptly use it to seize tyranny crushing all opposing parties, but it too is the case that no government will be any good or fight off these evils of nature and society if it lacks Power; as all other measures it is not something proposed in front of our modern Senate to come into vigour amid this worthless present constitution, but an eventual, and inevitable, step as we progress in our ideal State governed by those qualified with the science to wield that Power so.

At which point we descend back to that Platonic argument that no money or possession is inherently good; which has already been gone through on the previous chapter, but let us repeat it at some more easily tangible idea of Power as the dangers, and benefits, of acquiring more powerful tools – I mentioned how the surplus of money which allows some to open hospitals and schools also allow others to fall into the addiction of vices and sloth while today it is still controversial the topic of the understanding of the working of atoms allow to produce the cure to every disease and provides virtually endless energy for the modern human endeavours also allows for the building of world-ending bombs²⁰¹ so that instead of the also controversial topic of the freedom that allows some to contribute so greatly to the future of humankind also allows for this world-destroying licentiousness in unsustainable practices as we sadly behold today I will talk of what today cannot possibly be so, as about the iron both making swords as also making the tools to cultivate the ground.

Some ancient authors criticized the discovery of iron as thus some unexplainable how the source of evil to humankind²⁰² since it makes the most optimal and most pessimal instruments for human

²⁰⁰ “Philippo redintegratus est luctus geminatusque; et infelicitatem suam in liberis grauiorem, quod alter (su)peresset, censebat.”

– Ab Urbe Condita, From the Founding of the City, XL: 55.

²⁰¹ Funnily Concorcet also referred to gunpowder as ‘bombs that threatened to end the world’, but that instead allowed for better agriculture and development of humankind through new technologies. The actual quote is somewhere in his Sketch of humand history.

²⁰² “τὸν δὲ ἄκμονα καὶ τὴν σφῆραν τὸν τε τύπον καὶ τὸν ἀντίτυπον, τὸν δὲ ἐξελαυνόμενον σίδηρον τὸ πῆμα ἐπὶ πῆματι κείμενον, κατὰ τοιοῦνδε τι εἰκάζων, ὥς ἐπὶ κακῷ ἀνθρώπου σίδηρος ἀνεύρηται.”

– Ιστορίαι, Histories, I: 68.

life; being used for the best tools of work on our needed agriculture and to the building of our houses so that we are safer than ever, but also it is used to kill on war where with arrow and gunpowder we gave wings to the iron so that it can kill men more easily and faster – we soften it to form the most delicate pieces and cogs and on its hard form we cut and sculpt the thoughtest of rocks so that iron rules over all²⁰³.

“Thus when we excavate the earth for gold and gems and all riches or even iron which on belligerent matters is even more valuable than the said treasures and when after we perquire all her fibres and we live on the gapes of our excavation, where from time to time our sacred parent expresses her indignation trembling or opening such mouths, and when we find that she is not benign enough in presenting to us all her fertility and products of what is good for us we dig her viscera out to steal even what she kept hidden from us for it is not its time to be born yet and it is what destroys us what will be the result of us doing so for ages until we exhaust all she has and how far will our avarice penetrate before we decide that beseeching for the innocent and that they may see how much beatitude and delicacy is life in us having everything from the surface where she gives us on our hand is worth nothing?”²⁰⁴

Gaius Plinius attain such pitch of madness on this paragraph above on his indignation against miners that it is even hard to comment on it, but you have already seen the Daoist disease also blaming the tools for the problems; and how utterly detrimental for the human race would be to be forever stuck on the stone, or bronze or any other, age never progressing further for the reason that ‘better thus will allow us to cause more harm’ – or, on this case, ‘to show respect to nature and to not desecrate the sacrated mother earth’.

²⁰³ “Fiunt ex co optima, pessima vita instrumenta, inquit Plinius, liquidem ad agricultura opera, & adium costructiones eo utimur, eodem ad bela, & cades, non cominus solum, fed missili, volucrique: nam ut ocus mors perveniret ad hominem, alitem sillam fecit ipse, & penas ferro dedit. Nos diversas ferrit temperaturas edocebimus, & quomodo molle fiat, & durum, ut non solum ferrum, alia durissima fecet, fed porphyreticum marmor ipsum insculpat. Estin fumina ferri vis rerum omnium domitrix.”

– Magiae Naturalis XIII, where Portae sings such a praise to iron.

²⁰⁴ “Metalla nunc ipsaeque opes et rerum pretia dicuntur, tellurem intus exquirente cura multiplici modo, quippe alibi divitiis foditur quaerente vita aurum, argentum, electrum, aes, alibi deliciis gemmas et parietum lignorumque pigmenta, alibi temeritati ferrum, auro etiam gratius inter bella caedesque, persequimur omnes eius fibras vivimusque super excavata, mirantes dehiscere aliquando aut intremescere illam, ceu vero non hoc indignatione sacrae parentis exprimi possit. imus in viscera et in sede manium opes quaerimus, tanquam parum benigna fertilique qua calcatur. et inter haec minimum remedium gratia scrutamur, quoto enim cuique fodiendi causa medicina est? quamquam et hoc summa sui parte tribuit ut fruges, larga facilisque in omnibus, quaecumque prosunt. illa nos peremunt, illa nos ad inferos agunt, quae occultavit atque demersit, illa, quae non nascuntur repente, ut mens ad inane evolans reputet, quae deinde futura sit finis omnibus saeculis exhauriendi eam, quo usque penetratura avaritia. quam innocens, quam beata, immo vero etiam delicata esset vita, si nihil aliunde quam supra terras concupisceret, breviterque, nisi quod secum est!”

– Naturalis Historia XXXIII: 1.

And just as incomprehensible are the ignorant today fearing the growing Power of Science and complaining that the government should remain forever weak and worthless, for otherwise 'it would be able to do him more harm than it can now'.

Which criteria, thus, of who should wield that Power is our entire argument over again; that not by any guesswork of moralistic norms, as by 'the right of vote' from ignorant masses, but one that steams from that scientific method that is the only that can produce the desired results.

My single point is that there is no perfect platonic form of goodness, nor any such inherent property, but that it depends entirely on who wields that power; then we converge again that virtue can only be intentional, that is that the proper wielding of power can only be done by those qualified for it –

in Economy we have endeavoured to ascertain that way in which we obtain the greatest Power to the State, by moulding the environment to favour those desired niches, and in Politics we endeavour to get elected over economic matters a minister who is proficient in Economy and to makes the laws he who is proficient in Legislation, and so in every field we mould the political environment to favour those most qualified for the task in order to likewise select what is best for the State in maximizing its Power.

This, naturally, has been a mere sketch, but from which we can clearly see how the principles of Legislation in nothing differ from Politics, Economy or all of Nature; our goal is not some imaginary aim of some arbitrary 'justice', but as an exact science we merely ask 'what is the best to society?' and thus use Laws to build that social environment that will select for that good – namely, the increase of the Power of the State.

IV – The Mammalian Brain

You might have enjoyed Economics, but then flinched at the critic of the democracy which is so sacred in the world today and perhaps then nearly fainted with cognitive dissonance at these completely new proposals of Legislation – even so this last chapter is the most controversial yet.

I will endeavour to talk about something that even the greatest philosophers never cared to even try to defend; as it was, until very modern times, so sacred that unspokenly it was agreed to with no question or doubt convergently by all humankind – that is, the fantastical concept of ‘free will’.

Truly the only manner to even suppose such a thing is by the old beliefs that we are made at the image of the gods³⁰⁵ and different from all animals and all else on this exact mechanical world we somehow have this freedom from the ‘laws of nature’; and with our Origin, and that of all species likewise, known that baseless fantasy³⁰⁶ was entirely disproven beyond any doubt – still some of the worst men of the last century introduced the Quantum cultism of ‘true randomness’ in the hopes of having something outside the ‘laws of nature’ and with no exact or order to it, so that they might comfort themselves with that then being the mechanism to allow ‘free will’.

How that randomness of the ‘collapsing wave’ would allow us to have some kind of soul by giving the brain the power to defy the chemical concentrations and all of Physics to make its ‘own choices’ is impossible to explain, but supposing that worthless madness for a moment let us ask; when did homo sapiens break free from the ‘laws of physics’ to have that unexplainable mechanism of free will?

Free will is said to be this ability of making choices and what makes us unique, but will we not make a different choice if we are under the effects of crack or heroin? What if we are drunk? If

³⁰⁵ “黃帝問曰：天覆地載，萬物悉備，莫貴於人”

– 黃帝內經：素問, Huang Di Nei Jing: Suwen, XXV: 1 or 寶命全形論, where it says how from the heavens and earth every being came into existence, but that none of those are superior to men; a nice convergence found too in Chinese ideas; while it is even superfluous to quote the infinite stances in western religion about the direct accounts of the gods themselves making humans to their likeness for any myriad of materials.

³⁰⁶ “If we examine the most celebrated and remarkable of the different theories which have been given concerning the nature and origin of our moral sentiments, we shall find that almost all of them coincide with some part or other of that which I have been endeavouring to give an account of; and that if every thing which has already been said be fully considered, we shall be at no loss to explain what was the view or aspect of nature which led each particular author to form his particular system. From some one or other of those principles which I have been endeavouring to unfold, every system of morality that ever had any reputation in the world has, perhaps, ultimately been derived. As they are all of them, in this respect, founded upon natural principles, they are all of them in some measure in the right. But as many of them are derived from a partial and imperfect view of nature, there are many of them too in some respects in the wrong.”

– The Theory of Moral Sentiments VII: 1, which truly all such ideas of ‘moral philosophy’ are the mystical and worthless guesswork far from all of reality or science.

we will make different choices under those conditions, where is our uniqueness and free will then? Clearly that choice, like every other thing in existence, is merely the result of the environment around it; that is, of those chemicals activating a certain pathway or another – not any magical extradimensional power that goes against those chemicals to somehow make a ‘choice’ of ‘free will’.

Can we choose to be happy? Is it our choice to have depression and with our ‘free will’ we can cure it? Rather we need the medicaments that have exactly the molecules that our brain is lacking in order to properly activate those normal pathways of ‘happiness’. Can we choose our memories? Do we retain them after an accident that damages our brain? Do we retain the same behaviours regardless of what happened in such accident? Of course not; since all behaviour and all we are is merely the product of that brain structure running its chemical pathways – nothing more nor less.

As photons collide with our eyes it merely disturbs that delicate brain structure by producing a chemical gradient in due measure to the strength of that collision; that strength is what we process as ‘colour’ and what we do about it depends on the combination of those many photons creating an image, that is a certain pattern of disturbance to the general brain structure, so that our response and action to it is purely that chemical reaction that it caused, being processed back and forth by the ‘memories’ of structures already formed through life, rather than any ‘choice’ – any ‘conscious choice’ we make, in contrast to the ‘instinctive’ ones, is merely when that disturbance falls upon that calculating part rather than an hard-coded behaviour.

Any drug we take, how hot or cold we are and any other disturbance to those chemical reactions will lead to a different response to that stimulus or disturbance; since there is no ‘will’ to make some ‘free choice’, but as every other chemical reaction in existence it will follow an exact effect to every cause.

This is not an ‘opinion’; it is not the fantastical imaginations of ‘ego’ and ‘superego’ and all other imaginary things made-up by the worthless stupidity of Psychology – it is merely the undeniable reality we observe before us.

And as human knowledge and power converge into one we need to make that reality clear; we have this entire time been discussing how harmful it is to follow guesswork and fancies of the mind rather than the scientific exact reality – and so we need to ascertain these facts with the greatest exactness we can so that we may produce the best answer to all these problems we deal with.

By thus doing our best to understand our brain and ourselves we can then produce all the wonderful medicine that will save people from the crippling accumulated harm to their brain; further we will see how to preserve that structure, as natural selection did its usual awful job with our limited lifespan due to continual degradation of the cells, be it repairing it or copying that

organization into another lasting structure – in contrast to the baseless doctrine of ‘free will’ which will give those who follow it that holier-than-thou feeling of being special, but in reality condemns humankind to stagnate in that misery of death and disease as they wilfully avert their eyes from reality.

It is today beyond risible how one so-called naturalists argued to classify living things under the kingdoms of Plants, Animals and Men; putting ourselves as distinct and unique from all the rest, when the differences in our anatomy to other primates is infinitely less than of a seal to the remainder of the carnivore where it is virtually unanimously classified – so that indeed ‘if man had not been his own classifier, he would never have thought of founding a separate order for his own reception’²⁰⁷.

It was to them an unbearable insult to be classified as an ‘animal’; and still today there is some ubiquitous mockery and sarcasm among the most ignorant classes when any mention is made of our kinship to the other primates.

Identically it is impossible to see any serenity and intellect on those who make up ‘free will’ to man separating themselves not only from all other chemical reaction and living being, but from the very ‘exact and invariable laws of physics’ that they supposedly believe in.

That very understanding of the world show us that not long ago a single ancestral gave birth to what eventually split into some modern monkeys and us; if we have free will, when after that split did we suddenly develop it? Or does the monkey already has it?

Did it develop itself, or does it share that free will with the rats it descended from? Rats that used to have hard eggs when once upon a time there was no division between reptiles and we with our two fenestral holes; do all reptiles and tetrapoda have free will then? What about the bony fishes we all came from; did it already have or did it came into existence after coming onto land?

And so we can go back from these multicellular organisms to our single-celled ancestors; does a bacteria have free will? Even when we can perfectly see that it merely responds to its environment so that we can perfectly control its behaviour by putting on its way the due molecules and chemical gradients that control the logical gates of its answers to the environment?

If a bacteria does not have free will, where between it and us did it evolve? And if it has, then what about the simple organic molecules that first formed what we call ‘life’? Do molecules and atoms also have free will to choose what to bond with and what to do?

How, exactly, was that free will developed and by which mechanism does it ignore all of that physical reality to act independ of all else?

²⁰⁷ The Descent of Man VI.

We can see how ridiculous the defend of free will becomes in the face of the simplest facts about ourselves and all other living things; that we have never observed any hint of such physics-breaking mechanisms and only by pure ignorance and wishful whim it has ever been made-up at all.

All Natural Philosophy used of such fantasies to separate their mind as parts of some divine dimension apart from the physical world; and equally all system of ‘sentiments’ and ‘virtues’ as perfect Platonic forms that correspond to each existing ‘feeling’ – which foolishness has ruled over even the best minds throughout all our History, but which question was finally solved beyond any doubt as we found The Origin of Species, including ours.

All we have ever found that we are is such organization of our brain; which chemical machine of nerves evolved by the accumulation of behaviours so selected and in some mammals the more powerful tool of the capacity for computation producing new learnt behaviours rather than just the hard-coded by the inferior selection on our genes – and so the investigation of all phenomena of reality is such direct effect that they have delicately disturbing the chemical gradients of our nervous system, just as every ‘feeling’ is any such perturbation be it produced by such ‘intentional action’ as preached by cultists or any drug ingested with such identical molecules that so affect our brains.

There is no distinction thus between such two processes and all mystical ‘moral’ discussion or about the metaphysics of the nature of ‘perception’, which vain fantasy is deconnected from all factual reality – this is quite an extremely violent assertion, although the disdain of modern scientist to the word ‘philosophy’ is widespread, but at this point I am sure you know I do not say so by preconceived notions about something I am ignorant about and rather that being thoroughly familiar with human history and its many systems of philosophy I know full well the weight of my words²⁰⁸.

And indeed on my On the Origin of Subatomic Species I reformed the deficiencies in the methodology of our model of the universe, uniting not only Physics into a single system but also seamlessly to its arbitrary divisions of Chemistry or Biology and so on, while here now I have shown the meaningless of the imaginary divisions of ‘morality’ and ‘ethics’ or Economy and

²⁰⁸ Aristotle discussing about the soul being made of every element; so that it can then perceive all things by already having that thing to interact with.

Plato goes on about his forms; and since the soul is from divine origin it can thus recognize and feel all those things, which is what René says with his ‘je pense donc je suis’ – and what acephalous Kant argues that we cannot tell reality apart since we only have this limited connection between his fantasy world of his mind and the ‘physical world’.

And so on, as per my earlier assertion, that such is the mindless insanity which questions of pseudo-philosophy deal with questioning knowledge itself and the divine nature of morality; which, as shown, knowing our Origin and how the brain works dispel all such fantasies, and over ninety nine per cent of all human literature, to the realm of worthless dreams that they belong.

Politics, that is of all human affairs, from that same exact model of Physics by which in Logical Succession are thus all results and effects selected from their preceding causes.

All our knowledge converges into one single framework of reality; and that corresponds to our Power of achieving our goals for the future – be that the comforts and conveniences of technology engineering metal gadgets, the freedom from disease and death engineering our bodies or the extinction of calamities and miseries engineering both our natural and social environments, as all those are not distinct but part of the same all-pervading Science.

Now unto some speculative description about that ‘moral’ which so ruthlessly has been the source of so much misery in humankind.

Blind Natural Selection gave us sufficiently beautiful tools as our hands and our eyes, but of course such are worthless if we try without further tools of our own creation to try to do some detailed work of organizing circuits nanometers wide or the brutish work of breaking rocks with our bare hands or to try to observe microscopic germs or distant stars or even the nearby Sun with our naked us; as we have seen we have simply what was good enough for survival, but far from any ideal and ultimate form – so that we engineer all those tools, be them external or with medicine fixing our failing body, in order to achieve further than we naturally could.

As mentioned about monkeys, they have some innate ‘instinct’ of justice and many others natural behaviours; humans, too, are born already with personalities, as timid or extroverted babies, and of course not because of some mystical Samsara and past lives, but because our DNA carries the instructions of how to build our brain and many behaviours come hard-coded in – that is ‘instinct’.

The innate moral is just as our palate; evolved to our advantage to distinguish what is good for us and to reject what is harmful – and equally it is commonly wrong in enjoying as good some things that only do us harm and to have disgust to the just bitter medicine which brings health and a good life.

Such pleasures that were so useful for our benefit in acquiring food and reproducing are not abused directly by their intemperate harmful repetition as addictive vices that destroy lives; or the usage of drugs that simply stimulate those brain pathways more directly triggering the reward system for no beneficial thing – while our aversions and fears which saved us from eating bitter toxic substances now have to be ignored for the sake of the medicine which we consciously know that will be good for us.

That is what our innate ‘morality’ is; just as for monkeys it is a set of useful behaviours to live on social groups and thus was selected to be hard-coded on our DNA – but, of course, just like all other traits it is not some optimal perfection or supreme judge of justice but merely good enough for survival on those exact past situations.

On the Galapagos there are marine iguanas which for millions of years now only had predator on the sea; and thus when threatened they have the hard-coded behaviour of fleeing from the water and onto the beach – so that when pursued by a human they flee all the day to the beach, but run around the beach unable to try to flee into the sea where it would be safe, making it such a harmful instinct with that new factor involved since its innate behaviour is only any good for that environment it evolved in and was selected for.

Likewise our hard-coded moral instincts, evolved as irrational primates, are not only not sufficient as tools to develop our Laws and all else, but are straight out vestigial characteristics that nowadays are almost always a detriment to our faculties of deep rational analysis that can then produce the correct answer that will best attain our goal; all such cries of social morality are a pestilence of stupidity where we see grown man throwing tantrums when faced with the prospect of taking the bitter medicine that is the only and inevitable solution to our miseries – it is hard-coded in their brain and they irrationally, by their instinct with no argument, simply do not like it.

That is what it boils down to.

On the case of the iguana there, however, we could easily see the correct answer; how harmful its instinct was and that we – free from any such instinct – would not be lost unable to know what to do, but we would use the computing part of our brain to produce a versatile answer to that problem right on the spot.

That is what I call 'rational' in contrast with the 'instincts'; the later being those hard-coded behaviours that evolved for some other environment and far from optimal, the former that capacity to produce new answers and learnt to produce optimal behaviours fit exactly for that current situation – and also, of course, what allows us to predict thus the future and have precience of the result of our actions.

That plasticity is what is capable of giving us the 'correct answer' of how we should behave and what we should do; with our irrational innate moral instincts being a pure detriment that, just like the iguana, cannot accomplish even what it set out to do – and so I have through this entire treatise shown how worthless is that guesswork of moral norms in contrast with rational science, as a mere reflection of how our brain works since all human affairs are just such a tiny piece of our biology.

'It was awful of me to be so attached to a pet idea. That was an ordeal between my mind and my heart and it took a while for the mind to win and the heart to accept. Impersonal scientific objectivity is a goal to be sought by hard self-discipline; we are not born with it.', is something that Peer says that Sonneborn wrote; and, although he was clearly far from any such monumental accomplishment of shedding all morality nor even had such thing in mind, we can now clearly see some actual definition for those words – as the 'heart' as those hard-coded instincts which are

worthless on the search for any Truth and the exact knowledge, from the computing part of Reason, that is necessary for any objective to be attained.

So that laws are 'objective' to create the selective pressure to a better society; the 'heart' and guesswork of such moral laws are a plague to the future of all – as only the impersonal judgement of any environment will lead to the aimed goal.

Part of our critic was about 'cultures'; the systems learnt and passed on by that rational part, however which are founded on not solid rational base but the product of those innate morals.

It seems innocent enough such strange customs and religions as that of hindus in not eating certain things because on their imagination they are 'impure', but such distorted priority makes them feel more agony and regret in eating some nutritive and innocuous aliment than in practicing theft or murder, and that is sick to the extreme; leading to the most terrible scenarios as watching their sons get sick and die of hunger since their deficient mind refuses such aliment or medicine – and so is all irrational behavior based on morals since even when it appears to be advantageous in some situation it is always inferior to some rational decision of what is best, and on many others it is the most bizarre and unhappy tragedy depriving the individual from the mere basic capacity of preserving his life and that of his loved ones.²⁰⁹

This calculating part is the machine that gives us the capacity to see the future by learning the causes to then be able to predict the effects that will come from those previous and current causes; and, as discussed on the first section, much more powerful than the Cambrian explosion with the arrival of sight so will this one cause a wave of mass extinction as we bioengineer the less fit species to extinction and change the niches to those more beneficial ones – this is the next grand step on the mentioned 'means of selection', and with foresight so greater has the powers of selection become.

The grand source of all the mentioned misconceptions and failure at the art of government are due to those vestigial features of evolution that have long become detrimental to us as they often overpower the priority of that calculating part, Reason, in decision-making; being thus aware not only that 'emotions clouds our judgement', but truly of what 'emotion' and 'judgement' really are we are properly equipped in destroying those biases and twisted lenses in order to properly peer

²⁰⁹ "The judgment of the community will generally be guided by some rude experience of what is best in the long run for all the members; but this judgment will not rarely err from ignorance and weak powers of reasoning. Hence the strangest customs and superstitions, in complete opposition to the true welfare and happiness of mankind, have become all-powerful throughout the world."

– The Descent of Man IV, where rather he should have noticed that viral ideas idea only to reproduce itself infecting others, regardless of any benefit or harm to the host, are thus sadly selected for in society.

at what our actions will result in – so that we can then direct our endeavours to no longer wander lost as we have until now, but course the path that will result in achieving our aims.

And thus as we take on the responsibility, that is the dangers and benefits, of engineering both our society and the planet, which as if guided by the irresistible force of Destiny falls on our hands we willing or nill, we must give ourselves the best chance of not messing it up; by abandoning the mysticism of preconceived norms and resting on the sure foundations of Science – so that we may reach our happy destination by having the virtuous and worthy, those most capacitated, steering the ship of the State.

Just as the brain, the human society produced by it is too just such large scale chemical reaction; and the more we advance the art of ‘governing’ it converges with chemistry, where we perfectly calculate what each localized interference and perturbation will produce on the whole so that we direct that reaction to a desired form.

I have repeated that many times now, but what exactly is that form of government in concrete terms of official position and their functions? On the majority of questions the correct answer is ‘it depends’; and this too is the case here.

Each country in the modern world is in a slightly different position and what is the best next step to them and what they should change has to be tailored exactly to them; a too violent remedy will lead to destruction rather than a cure so that by gradual steps the ship has to be redirected to the proper course.

Rather than any dogma and sacred inviolable laws of some institution or policy we at every decision merely ask ‘what is the most beneficial to the State?’; so that the answer varies to the current situation in question just as the details and exactness of that answer change as our art of Political Science advances – so that the best and most lasting I can leave is such quasi-ambiguous principle of the exact scientific method of Logical Succession which is to be applied to find the answer of each situational problem.

So I will leave merely a simple sketch of what some end goal of those changes would be like.

It would be a State managed by not exactly ‘the best manager in existance’, but the most fit for the job; even if one is extremely skilled he is useless if he cannot work well with others; and what we maximize for is the final total result.

A parliament elected by the people will have that same problems as the democracy; besides that even with the greatest genius from the entire world population we could fill a parliament where all persons were equally able to judged between such problems of urban engineering, economy,

medicine and so on²¹⁰ – so that rather than any division of power for the sake of division or representation is a meaningless goal, but we do not have that idealized Greek model of a wise philosopher as the supreme king simply because even if some person had that absolute mastery of all skills he still would not have time to exercise them all perfectly.

To that, then, I envision a government that has its own institutions for each scientific art; akin to an university where people are trained in Legislation, in Economy, in Management, in Engineering and so on – and where any who has learnt from somewhere else can be tested in his qualification.

That House of Legislation or House of Economy and so on would deal with fulfilling the necessities of the government for that skill; rather than any outside vote of the ignorant masses it would be akin to the previous example of the fruit when the science had began – the masses no longer have any say in what concerns that art and they among themselves discuss and further develop that art.

The House of Management then would have its high council elected amongst themselves that would elect their representative who would manage the state; and so on rather than any hand-picked minister each governmental institution would have as a focus not training professionals for the market, as the worthless universities today that are nothing more than a cartel selling diplomas, but using the resources of the State to further improve that art and in turn use it to the best possible way in the governing of the State.

When that high council is divided in its votes to who is the most qualified to represent them as president we can follow the Roman system of classes; rather than the corrupt shameful practices of king-makers and coalitions being brought over we must delegate the vote to the next best qualified – in this case the high council of those other arts who will have to work with that president. If that too fails in producing some night unanimity then we can go down to the broader councils of the arts; with the ignorant masses being the last class only in the most extreme of cases resorted too if we cannot find any better way to decide.

Truly it cannot stop people from exchanging favours and buying each other out, but it is not the masses they have to please to be promoted; and no system can remain functional if all people are corrupt seeking their own gain – and that is the only way for those House of knowledge to be corrupted, as the other Houses act as checks against the corruption of a group and it will only

²¹⁰ A line from Adolf; read the third chapter of *Mein Kampf* for a wonderful critic of the parliamentary system – beautifully describing how in his mind he could imagine no other form of government than that political freedom of the parliament, but when we went on continually to watch the debates he realized quite the contrary in how inherently corrupted, immoral and unskilled they were as those traits were the most successful one for that environment of where universal suffrage is the criterion for power.

truly degenerate to be possessed by the unskilled if it is thus that the art itself is erased and corruption takes over.

As the example of the healers; if they fail in providing results and in working then the population, that lowest class, can only revolt against it and destroy it to start that art all over again – otherwise it does not concern them in any decision of that art, but only those of the established House in question.

This is the basic structure of the government to be aimed at; it provides the environment to improve the arts and select those most skilled in it to occupy those positions of power for the sake of the State – but back to more general terms, it is simply a technocracy built upon those principles of Logical Succession, that is by the means of shaping the environment to select for those niches to be filled by technical experts rather than the current attempt at ‘technocrats’ which is merely the appointment of some random persons who happen to be repudiated by one or another to be a good manager.

As I so endorse those teaching facilities I must mention that the reader should not picture anything even close to our modern schools and universities; which are a monstrous quartet with business corporations very far from any ideal of knowledge and learning.

The origin of our modern school system was on the usual European revolutions; this time to supersede the old system and brainwash into the children their new identity as a nation – and as so effective a tool to radicalize people into patriotism it quickly spread.

It has been so used until very modern times, but as the indolence of peace set in it gradually transformed in what we see today; millions of teachers hired simply to hinder any learning the students could actually do.

A friend of mine was keen on conspiratory theories, and even worse on christianism, so that he became a teacher and could just spew that to his students; and disagreeing with their master meant a failing grade – likewise a professor who had a diploma on geology was a spiritist who used dowsing rods because he ‘did not believe on science since they lied saying that the earth was not flat’, or the common absurd of someone ‘master in economy’ defending socialism.

So that even the companies not only require diplomas, but ‘years of experience’; since they know that people leave their universities wholly unqualified for any service!

They leave their two decades of time and all other resources spent on ‘learning’ with the same knowledge that the average United Statian, on their developed ‘best nation’, has in geography; that was what their ‘learning system’ approved – which risable reality only shows how distant from any ‘learning’ such system is.

I myself never finished high school since I saw how uselessly worthless it is; how all adults knew nothing of that they had 'learnt' and how I was literally advised to memorize everything quickly and then forget it all forever right after being done with the exams - and I was told these 'techniques' pridefully as if it shew their intelligence in adapting so well to what the system requires, but to me they revealed only such absolute incomprehensible absurdity of why would anyone have to do such a waste of the time of their lives, of their efforts, work and mental faculties.

I thus noticed how it was worth nothing any such discipline or school work which were thrown in the trash right after; that the only purpose and criterion to get a passing grade was the submission to the authority of the teachers, doing any acephalous uselessness commanded in exchange for some grades - a brainwashing that trained the individuals to their adult life obeying their boss.

Only much later I learnt its history that truly that was the original purpose; and that now it was simply abandoned to be the playground of those teachers flexing that compulsory submission to their authority and so abuse that opportunity to indoctrinate their fantasies rather than teaching anything - and much less is any critic in search of the Truth allowed, but merely to faithfully repeat what was told him.

Where any analysis about the system makes such clear; as the fact that all the teachers prepare their classes, exams and everything else for the class - are they all equality capacitated or there are some who prepare better classes? If there are why then not institute such as the standard to be followed, and save the other millions of teachers to waste their work only to harm the student giving him a worse content? For thus the system clearly pays such to cause evil instead of any contribution to the learning; and commonly they take the entire liberty, as already said, of ignoring completely the material to present their ignorant doctrines since also most of such, as again on many places in the United States where proper biology is often banned on schools since reality offends their fantastical beliefs, know nothing more than the common man - and obeying acquiescing to whatever he says is the only criterion to move on!

Therefore a considerable part of the population, millions, rather of doing any useful work only harm the very society; while consuming such millions of salaries, resources and infrastructure - when a delegation of such 'good teachers' would cost infinitely less to determinate the optimal lessons to be cursed and necessary knowledge.

Still the army of acephalous teacher only repeating such official standardized content would be a great waste, although a gigantic improvement from de current quality, and it suffices to literally watch recorded lessons; for decades now there is not such necessity of endless repetition of work by hand - they are all functional unemployed who artificially keep their position for the general detriment of the nation.

But besides such layer of parasites there is the entire worthless idea of transporting children to the same place to receive such learning; or that they have to suffer in an identical mould forced purely based on the age of each one – the historic beginning shows a great system for such brainwashing, but which is perfectly worthless for any transmission of knowledge and professionalization.

Instead of that horrible system, then, what I have in mind are institutions that truly deal solely with learning; not those forced years and a mould, but if one wants to learn how to write he goes to the course that deals with just that – if one wants to learn calculus or environmental sciences he can take just that course, and receive the diploma for that single skill, once he has also the diploma for all the requisite courses in maths or in maths with chemistry with physics with geology for the later.

To get a job he needs only to have those required skills on a diploma; with an exam to determine if he knows it or not – so that a single week can be enough for some to get a diploma, and for other an year, depending solely of their proven skills rather than any worthless measurement of hours there in class or submission to the whims of some teacher.

That is the general view of the institutions, those meant solely to evaluate those worthy of the diploma and provide guidelines for skills, I there described rather than anything akin to our modern system of universities.

That longwinded tautology where I repeated the same argument dozens of times upon random specific cases was an exemplification to the obvious; that Economy and the Politics of government are a science with sharply defined rights and wrongs based not on opinion but the unchanging observed reality of this universe – the principles of Economy differ only in name from the principle of exact causes and effects which in Logical Succession govern the production of all so-called laws and particles in ‘inanimate’ Physics, and which are inherited by the chemical automata studied under the arbitrary definition of Biology as they, and their ideas and societies, are Naturally Selected by simply differing degrees of complexity.

Now, this is all very perplexing.

The raising of animals for their resources is necessary for life, but many complain about ‘inhumane’ conditions that animals ‘suffer’ and that they should ‘live a happy life and be killed instantly without suffering’; is it ‘moral’ then to surgically cut their nerves or dope them so that they do no longer feel ‘pain’? Or hijack their mind to live in happiness in a Matrix-like world whole ignorant and not feeling while we butcher them alive? Since ‘suffering’ and ‘pain’ are nothing more than those signal responses from the nerves and nothing more; honed to make the animal struggle against what it perceives as harmful – just as likewise ‘pleasure’ is honed to seek what it perceives as beneficial.

The question in that is about humans; pain is an essential sense that saves us from harm, and being insensitive to it leads to horrible injuries that would be avoided otherwise. And pleasure we know can damn us in addictions of all kinds rather than being a good.

So what is this society that brings the 'greater good'? Is it one filled with drug-addicts and people laying on their Matrix-bed feeling the greatest pleasure in their dream while their body decays?

Or should we cut those failed pleasure senses and be guided solely by our intellect in optimizing production living like a single collective hive that most assuredly guarantees the survival of our species even after the Sun and the Milky Way are extinguished?

These cannot be answered with any knowledge; science will not give us some ultimate goal or purpose in 'life', but what we know is that dying is a horrible disease that robs almost all of our very limited attention - that the reckless 'enjoyment' of burning away the reserves of our natural resources will only doom our future or of our children.

So let us no longer wander lost in guesswork and sweet lies; let us adopt the proper science that can infallibly achieve its goals - so that once we are immortal free of all care we can finally be in the position to indulge in the discussion of what our Fate will ultimately be.